DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 184 439 HE 012 463

AUTHOR Nelsen, William C., Ed.; Siegel, Michael E., Ed.
TITLE Effective Approaches to Faculty Development.
INSTITUTION Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 154p.
AVAILABLE FROM Association of American Colleges, 1818 R St. N.W., Washington, DC 20009 ($5.00)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; *College Faculty; Consortia; Consultants; Core Curriculum; Curriculum Development; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; Interdisciplinary Approach; Interprofessional Relationship; Leaves of Absence; Professional Continuing Education; *Professional Development; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; *Retraining; Role Models; Skill Development; Teacher Exchange Programs; Teacher Workshops; Workshops

ABSTRACT

Essays are collected on faculty development programs that are felt to have positively affected both the institutions and individual faculty members. They include: Faculty Development: Promises, Realities and Needs (William C. Nelsen, Michael E. Siegel); Improving the Scholarly Climate on Campus through a Program of Small Grants (David Marker); Encouraging Faculty Learning: A Program of Study Leaves (Robert T. Voekel); Retraining and Renewing Faculty in a Time of Retrenchment (Zeddie Bowen); Renewing Faculty through Faculty Growth Planning (P. Judson Carlberg); The Teaching Consultant at Earlham (Gerald R. Bakker, Paul A. Lacey); The Teaching-Learning Center: Encouraging Faculty to Share Ideas (Barbara Helling, Erling Jorstad); Talking about Teaching: The Contributions of Senior Faculty to Junior Faculty (G. Melvin Hipps); Teaching Workshops for New Faculty Members: Aiding the Transition from Graduate School to Teaching (John F. Noonan); Common Language: A Faculty Response to Developing Specific Skills (James D. Pickering); Preparing Faculty for Teaching Core Curriculum Courses (D. Michael Rivage-Seul); Developing and Challenging Faculty through Interdisciplinary Teaching-Learning (Alvin M. White); The Role of a Faculty Committee in Facilitating Development (Alfred Romer); Corporate Faculty Development: Enhancing Collegiality on Campus (Bruce Haywood); The Consortium Approach to Faculty Development (Steven C. Scholl); In Praise of an Interdisciplinary Symposium (Milla B. Riggio); Faculty Exchange: Overcoming Academic Calcification (John Rodes); Developing a New Point of View (Robert V. Smith); Learning with a Colleague (James Ransom); Old Dog, New Tricks (Robert Menefee); Empirical Findings on Faculty Development Programs (Michael E. Siegel); and Faculty Development: Perceived Needs for the 80's (William C. Nelsen). (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE 012 463

ED184439

Effective Approaches to Faculty Development

William C. Nelsen
Michael E. Siegel

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AAC

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

HE 012 463

Effective Approaches to Faculty Development

William C. Nelsen
Michael E. Siegel
Editors

Association of American Colleges
Washington, D.C.

Copyright © 1980, Association of American Colleges

Effective Approaches to Faculty Development

Library of Congress Catalog Card No.: 79-93173

Preface

If one wished to state a theme for the collection of essays in this book, it would be simply this: effective faculty renewal is indeed possible. The essays demonstrate that colleges and universitites can undertake programs and projects that will make a positive difference in both the individual lives of many of their faculty and in the collective academic lives of their campuses.

This book is one result of the Project on Faculty Development of the Association of American Colleges. Spanning the calendar year of 1979, the AAC Project focused on the evaluation of faculty renewal programs at twenty colleges which had undertaken comprehensive faculty development programs during the past five years.

The Project was born under the leadership of Dr. Mark Curtis, President of the Association of American Colleges and Dr. John Sawyer, President of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, which provided financial support for the Project through a grant to AAC. Recognizing that faculty development had been a major theme of American higher education during the 1970's and that colleges, often aided by grants from foundations and the federal government, had instituted and experimented with a wide variety of faculty renewal programs, these two educational leaders felt that it was time to take a hard look at results. What kind of impact did such programs have on college campuses? What worked and didn't work with faculty? Why and why not? What program ideas would be useful to share with others?

Dr. William C. Nelsen, Vice President and Dean of St. Olaf College, was asked to direct the Project and was granted a special leave from St. Olaf for this purpose. Dr. Michael Siegel of the School of Government and Public Administration, The American University, served as Assistant Director. In the spring of 1979 the Director visited all twenty colleges, ordinarily spending two to three days at each campus interviewing faculty, administrators, and students. Colleges in the Project were: Austin, Bates, Beloit, Berea, Bowdoin, Colgate, Davidson, Earlham, Franklin and Marshall, Furman, Gettysburg, Haverford, Hope, Kenyon, Lawrence, Mt. Holyoke, Occidental, Pomona, St. Lawrence, and Trinity. Altogether more than five hundered persons were interviewed on these campuses.

Assisting the Director at each campus was one additional interviewer. In addition to Dr. Siegel, who served as an interviewer at three of the campuses, fifteen persons, all with experience in faculty development, were used as consultants for the purpose: Dr. George Allan, Dickinson College; Dr. Paula Brownlee, Union College; Dr. Richard Cantwell, Carleton College; Mrs. Gwen Clavadetscher, University of Puget Sound; Dr. Bradley Dewey,

Franklin and Marshall College; Dr. J. Edwards Dirks, University of California, Santa Cruz; Dr. Ann Ferren, American University; Dr. Donald Griffin, Rollins College; Dr. George Hazzard, AAC Project Quill; Dr. Paul Lacey, Earlham College, Dr. Thomas Maher, Wichita State University; Dr. Glen Nelson, Luther College; Dr. E.C. Reckard, Centre College of Kentucky; Dr. Stephen Scholl, Ohio Wesleyan University; and Dr. Al Smith, University of Florida.

In addition to this book two other publications report the results of the AAC Project. The September, 1979 issue of the *Forum for Liberal Education* contains articles by the Project directors and vignettes of useful programs in faculty development, and a forthcoming book by the Director, tentatively entitled *Renewal of the Teacher-Scholar*, focuses on important issues which deserve more careful attention if colleges are to construct effective renewal programs. But the Project directors felt that it was also important to let administrators and faculty themselves speak about programs which were judged to be especially valuable. Thus, this collection of essays. In the pages that follow, faculty and administrators who have taken leadership in faculty renewal on their campuses report on a variety of useful approaches. Also, and we believe for the first time, several faculty who themselves have benefitted from faculty development programs testify as to the effect of such programs on their professional lives.

A special word of thanks must be voiced to several persons who helped us carry out the Project on Faculty Development and make this volume of essays a reality: to Dr. Curtis, Mr. Van Wilkins, and others on the AAC staff who gave continuing support, to the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation which provided not only financial backing but also personal interest through Dr. Sawyer and Miss Claire List, to the faculty, administrators, and the students at the twenty colleges who were very cooperative and hospitable throughout the campus visits, to the fifteen consultants who assisted admirably in the on-campus interviews, to Dr. Eileen Kuhns, Professor of Higher Education at Catholic University, who provided very helpful advice in the research design for our study, and to Mrs. Ellynn Crippin who typed the manuscript with speed and care.

Finally a special word of appreciation must be given to those who contributed their first-hand observations and opinions through the essays in this volume. The essays show clearly that faculty development can be carried out in a variety of ways to meet a variety of needs. It is our hope that this volume will be of real help to those colleges beginning, extending or reevaluating their programs designed to encourage faculty renewal.

William C. Nelsen
Michael E. Siegel
Washington, D.C.
December, 1979

Contents

Preface

PART I: INTRODUCTION

Faculty Development: Promises, Realities and Needs
William C. Nelsen and Michael E. Siegel 1

PART II: EFFECTIVE PROGRAMS IN FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Introduction 7

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Improving the Scholarly Climate on Campus Through a Program of Small Grants
David Marker 9

Encouraging Faculty Learning: A Program of Study Leaves
Robert T. Voekel 15

Retraining and Renewing Faculty in a Time of Retrenchment
Zeddie Bowen 20

Renewing Faculty Through Faculty Growth Planning
R. Judson Carlberg 25

INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Teaching Consultant at Earlham
Gerald R. Bakker and Paul A. Lacey 32

The Teaching-Learning Center: Encouraging Faculty to Share Ideas
Barbara Helling and Erling Jorstad 38

Talking About Teaching: The Contributions of Senior Faculty to Junior Faculty
G. Melvin Hipps 43

Teaching Workshops for New Faculty Members: Aiding the Transition from Graduate School to Teaching
John F. Noonan 49

Common Language: A Faculty Response to Developing Specific Skills
James D. Pickering 57

CURRICULUM CHANGE

Preparing Faculty for Teaching Core Curriculum Courses
D. Michael Rivage-Seul 64

Developing and Challenging Faculty Through Interdisciplinary Teaching-Learning
Alvin M. White 71

ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Role of a Faculty Committee in Facilitating Faculty Development
Alfred Romer 77

Corporate Faculty Development: Enhancing Collegiality on Campus
Bruce Haywood 84

THE CONSORTIUM APPROACH

The Consortium Approach to Faculty Development:
the GLCA Experience
Steven C. Scholl 91

PART III: PARTICIPATION IN FACULTY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES: THE PARTICIPANTS SPEAK

Introduction 103

In Praise of an Interdisciplinary Symposium
Milla B. Riggio 105

Faculty Exchange: Overcoming Academic Calcification
John Rodes 111

Developing a New Point of View
Robert V. Smith 115

Learning with a Colleague
James Ransom 120

Old Dog, New Tricks
Robert Menefee 124

PART IV: ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT EFFECTIVENESS AND FUTURE NEEDS IN FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Empirical Findings on Faculty Development Programs
Michael E. Siegel 131

Faculty Development: Perceived Needs for the 1980's
William C. Nelsen 145

PART I

Introduction

Faculty Development: Promises, Realities and Needs

WILLIAM C. NELSEN AND MICHAEL E. SIEGEL

In contrast with the 1960's when American higher education seemed to concentrate primarily on students, the 1970's witnessed a focus on faculty. This focus came from three important directions within the academy — from administrators concerned about the dangers of decreasing turnover in faculties, from students with new opportunities to evaluate and call for improvements in teaching, and from faculty themselves as they faced several demoralizing problems of this decade and foreboding perceptions about the next.

While the lack of turnover in college faculties has sometimes been overplayed, there is little doubt that many colleges must work with relatively high percentages of tenured faculty and fewer position openings at junior levels. Recognizing this fact, college and university administrators began to seek different ways of infusing new ideas, encouraging continuing personal growth, and creating possibilities for curricular change within a less mobile faculty. One key means of doing so was an organized faculty development program.

Students also caused us to focus on faculty. Enlarging and changing student populations meant that faculty would have to learn to deal with different kinds of students. At the same time students were taking a more active interest in evaluating teaching and demonstrating an unwillingness to accept lower-quality instruction. One important way in which faculty and administrators tried to respond was an organized faculty development program.

Finally, faculty themselves perceived that some focus on their own status was called for. Faculty also were concerned about fewer opportunities for mobility, higher costs for professional travel and research, adapting to changing student clientele, impending enrollment problems, salaries out-of-step with the constantly burgeoning cost-of-living, severe competition for publications, and seeming loss of public confidence. While many faculty reacted to these situations with a sense of cynicism or even despair, others either called for or were ready to respond to programs of revitalization and renewal. Although most faculty would have preferred to call them programs of "faculty support" or "faculty opportunity," organized faculty development programs were welcomed as one important means of meeting their own perceived needs.

Launching faculty development programs, however, proved to be a problematic course for college administrators or interested faculty to take. Faculty, already very skeptical, perceived that they were being "dealt with," "administered to," or that they were "ill" and "in need of therapy."

In many cases, faculty members were correct in their perception of a poorly disguised paternalism on the part of the faculty developers. Too often, faculty developers, with little forethought and little input from faculty themselves, tried to develop programs which they hoped would magically transmogrify ailing faculty into productive scholars and teachers. Turgid academics would be transformed into humanistic educators. Shoddy scholars would become dynamic contributors to their discipline. And dutiful but quiescent faculty would become active participants in campus politics.

Although the early program initiators were correct in recognizing the limitations of faculty, especially in terms of meeting the needs of a rapidly changing student clientele and an ever-changing society, they clearly over-estimated the power of their own ideas to bring about change and, probably unwittingly, assumed the posture of therapists administering care to suffering faculty.

We have learned a great deal from the mistakes that the pioneers made; however, we also have come to recognize their contributions. What the pioneers in faculty development began to uncover was the pitifully narrow definition of faculty success extant in higher education. They found that the model of the teacher-scholar was tattered; faculty were polarized on one side or the other, opting for either excellence in teaching or for quality research. The reward system was skewed, generally favoring the scholarship side of the model, or ambiguous, thereby making promotion too much of a guessing game.

The faculty developers uncovered feelings of inadequacy and resentment among many faculty members who did not or could not consistently publish in reputable journals or consult with government or business officials, whose names were not immediately identified with famous books, politicians, or enterprises. They also sensed and pointed to the irony of this situtation: professors who spent hours expatiating about the importance of individual differences among students could not accept that reality among themselves. Professors could only conceive of one route to success.

One of the achievements of early faculty developers, then, was to help faculty and administrators recognize the multiplicity of approaches to successful faculty performance. Some faculty, indeed, are brilliant scholars and attract national attention and financial support. Others have strong abilities in designing courses, in facilitating collegial interaction among faculty from different disciplines, and in molding curricula. Others have tremendous rapport with students, really come alive in the classroom, and know how to make students think. Still other faculty have real organizational talents that can be tapped for chairing campus committees or for part time administrative duties.

At their best, then, faculty development efforts have contributed to increasing the opportunities for faculty members to grow in their unique, even idiosyncratic ways. They have held out for faculty real challenges to utilize and apply their skills to campus needs. At their worst, faculty development programs have attempted to force faculty into specific new roles defined too narrowly by others.

The major purpose of this volume of essays is to demonstrate that effective faculty development programs not only can be, but already have been constructed to bring forth this variety of unique faculty talents and potential contributions. Colleges have, during the past several years, recognized the need for faculty development and for assisting faculty renewal in a variety of ways to meet a variety of needs.

In general, the faculty development programs reported in the essays which follow have facilitated significant improvements on the campuses where they have been implemented. Many of the faculty we interviewed in the AAC Project on Faculty Development expressed feelings of revitalization, indicating that their lives had actually changed as a result of faculty development activities. Instead of settling for the despair which seems so ubiguitous today, these faculty seek to breathe new life into the academy and to pass it on, renewed and revivified, to the next generation of teacher-scholars.

Lives have indeed been changed. Faculty have discovered new areas of academic inquiry, developed new teaching interests, designed new courses, utilized new modes of teaching, worked with colleagues from other disciplines, and written long-term growth plans. Administrators have seen improvements in scholarly output on their campuses, the design of new interdisciplinary courses which attract students and the increase of collegial interaction among their faculties. Campuses as a whole have been improved also, even in these difficult times. Committee systems have been streamlined and reward structures more clearly formulated as a result of faculty development.

Of course, work still lies ahead. On one level, there still needs to be more attitude change. Even on campuses where faculty development was generally well-accepted, we encountered the old sense of despair and cynicism among some faculty. Spoken in a different accent and couched in slightly different terms, the words of despair and cynicism are still being voiced.

On another level, the work that lies ahead is enormous. There are, of course, budgetary considerations. When the funding from foundations or the federal government runs out or when no outside assistance is forthcoming, it will be up to each college to commit funds for faculty development. As well, it will be up to administrators and faculty leaders to develop clear reward systems to encourage diversified approaches to faculty development among their inevitably diverse faculties. It will be necessary for faculty to plan for change and to perceive opportunities for growth in their immediate environment.

Higher education faces serious problems, including the very real prospect of declining enrollments in the years ahead. But perhaps the greatest catastrophe of all would be the disappearance — or even the diminution — of dedicated teacher-scholars who enjoy teaching students, who maintain active scholarly interests, and who contribute actively to campus and community life. Faculty development is one method of helping colleges identify these teacher-scholars, encourage their continuing growth and renewal, and reward their achievements.

Recognizing that many colleges are only now at the beginning stages of faculty development or are now at the point of expanding or reassessing their current programs, we hope that administrators and faculty will gain both insight and encouragement from reading the essays which follow.

PART II

Effective Programs in Faculty Development

Effective Programs in Faculty Development: Introduction

To be sure our visits to the twenty campuses in the AAC Project on Faculty Development uncovered a number of programs in faculty development that were not very effective — even a few complete failures. But we were heartened to discover a variety of useful programs judged by directors, participants, and the outside interviewers to be relatively successful. During the course of the Project we also learned of exciting programs on several other campuses.

Effective faculty development programs are being carried out at many colleges around the country. The essays which follow, written by persons directly involved in program leadership, report on a representative sample of successful renewal efforts. Most of the projects described here are from campuses in the AAC survey, but a few are from other colleges.

The essays are presented under five major headings: professional development, instructional development, curriculum change, organizational change, and the consortium approach. The first four categories formed the conceptual basis for evaluating renewal efforts in the AAC Project. (See Michael Siegel's article on empirical findings later in this volume.) The fifth category simply reflects the unique aspects of a comprehensive consortium approach to faculty renewal.

Professional development refers to a faculty member's continuing growth as scholar and contributor to the intellectual community both on campus and in his or her profession. David Marker, in his essay, describes how a program of relatively small individual grants can significantly enhance the scholarly climate of a campus. Robert Voekel demonstrates that through a program of study leaves faculty can usefully enlarge their perspectives by stepping outside their disciplines. Even in a time of retrenchment faculty can find meaning and excitement both in deepening their knowledge of their regular discipline and by taking on new assignments in related disciplines according to Zeddie Bowen's essay. Finally, Judson Carlberg reports on how faculty can be encouraged to look several years ahead and devote themselves to specific professional development goals through a program of faculty growth plans.

Instructional development focuses on programs designed to encourage faculty to share ideas for teaching, consider new (and old) approaches, and acquire new skills. Bakker and Lacey describe the unique role that a respected

faculty member can play as the teaching consultant for other faculty. Helling and Jorstad demonstrate how faculty have much to offer through an organized program of sharing ideas for effective teaching and learning. Senior faculty, by assisting junior faculty to develop as teachers, find that they too benefit from the experience, according to the essay by Melvin Hipps. Jack Noonan in his essay analyzes key issues for conducting a teaching workshop for faculty trying to make the adjustment from graduate students to college teachers. Finally, in this category focusing on instructional development, James Pickering relates how faculty can acquire new instructional skills, in this case improving their abilities to write and analyze the writing of their students.

Curriculum change can provide useful opportunities for faculty renewal. In this section two authors report on how either formal or informal curriculum renewal can challenge faculty to broaden their perspectives and knowledge. Michael Rivage-Seul in his essay shows how faculty from various disciplines benefit from preparation for teaching an interdisciplinary core curriculum course. Alvin White demonstrates how both faculty and specific courses are renewed by encouraging faculty to take seriously a more holistic interdisciplinary view of their learning and teaching.

Organizational change as a means of enhancing faculty development on campus was unfortunately undertaken by very few of the campuses in the AAC survey. Yet in the long run, reorganizing committees and evaluation and reward systems and encouraging new structures for faculty interaction may have more to do with motivating faculty renewal than anything else. In this section, Alfred Romer reports on the key role played by a prominent faculty committee in facilitating faculty development on his campus and Bruce Haywood analyzes the important effects for both individuals and the corporate faculty in a concerted, four-year institution-wide effort at intellectual interaction on his campus.

The *consortium approach* to faculty development has several important advantages, as it offers "neutral ground" for a variety of approaches which colleges find difficult to undertake individually. Steve Scholl in his essay reports on the experiences of one consortium that saw faculty development as a key way to serve its constituent colleges.

Faculty development programs cannot simply be transplanted from one campus or consortium to another. Programs must grow out of the special needs and potentialities of local situations. But it is our hope that these essays will stimulate the thinking of both faculty and administrators by revealing the variety of ways in which faculty are already engaged in effective renewal programs.

Improving the Scholarly Climate on Campus Through a Program of Small Grants

DAVID MARKER

I. History of the Hope Program of Small Grants

In 1958, Irwin Lubbers, then president of Hope College, persuaded an alumnus to make $1,000 available annually for what was to become the College's first faculty development grant. Since that time the College has put an increasing amount of money into small grants for faculty summer study and research. By 1974, the total sum available from all sources for grants for summer study and research was $8,500; the total number of awards made in that year was 19.

In 1958, when the First Faculty Fellowship was established, the College faculty numbered 65. By 1974, it had grown to 140 full-time-equivalent members. Interest in the summer grant program grew correspondingly. As a consequence, the number of applications for grants continued to increase while the total resources available to fund them remained constant. With limited funds available to respond to an increasing number of requests, small grants ordinarily were available only for program expenses. Among those proposals funded were requests for: travel to libraries and university research laboratories, travel to professional meetings, publication costs, computer time, small laboratory apparatus, etc. The average small grant awarded in 1974 was $450. Two special fellowships provided stipends of $1,000 and $500 respectively.

Along with a doubling in faculty size in one and one-half decades there was a concurrent increase in the emphasis on the importance of scholarly work as the foundation for good teaching. In the fifties and sixties, that tradition grew especially strong in the natural sciences and formed the basis for an important component of the College's current program of faculty development.

The principal exponents of this increased emphasis on scholarly activity were members of the chemistry faculty. As they did research to enhance their teaching effectiveness and to enlarge the body of knowledge, students were rather naturally drawn into faculty laboratories to work alongside them.

David Marker is Provost at Hope College, Holland, Michigan.

It soon became obvious that joint student-faculty research was not only a powerful tool for faculty development, but also an extremely effective way of teaching chemistry to undergraduates. Students learned by reading text books, by listening to lectures, and by doing laboratory exercises. Perhaps more importantly, they learned by being intimately involved in doing fundamental and original chemical research whose fruits were worthy of publication.

The College's philosophy of science education was profoundly shaped by the commitment of the chemists. In the last decade, this philosophy has been adopted by all of the science departments in the College. Its central tenet is that the College's educational mission, including both the teaching of students and the development of faculty, can best be realized by bringing teacher/scholars into a *close working relationship* with motivated and responsive students. Its principal benefits are two-fold. First, faculty members maintain their vitality as teacher/scholars by doing research at the forefront of knowledge. Second, by the time Hope graduates have entered graduate or professional school they may have co-authored one or more scientific papers with a member of the Hope faculty. As a consequence they are actively recruited by the very best graduate schools and they often finish advanced degrees in shorter-than-normal time.

Research involving so many faculty and students required more resources than the College was able to supply from its annual operating budget. As a consequence, faculty applied for summer grants in order to assist them in bringing their work to a level where they could apply successfully for support from external agencies or foundations. Subsequent grants from the Research Corporation, Sloan Foundation, and the NSF-COSIP Program were of great assistance in enabling other science departments to adopt the "learning-by-doing" philosophy.

In 1973, under the leadership of President Gordon Van Wylen, the College applied for, and received, a grant of $160,000 from the Mellon Foundation for a greatly expanded program of faculty development. The most important component of the proposed program was a significant increase in the number and magnitude of summer grants. In fact, sixty-five percent of the total grant funds were reserved for this purpose. Recipients of Mellon Summer Faculty Fellowships (as they came to be called) received a summer stipend of up to $1,200 plus program expenses not to exceed $400. A stipend of $80 per week was given to each student doing research with a faculty fellow.

During the five-year period in which the Mellon grant was active, 91 Summer Faculty Fellowships were awarded for study or research. Of these, 72 were for the development of the recipients as scholars or artists and 19 were made to individuals (sometimes working in groups) to design or redesign the content or structure of a course or to improve pedagogy.

The grant from the Mellon Foundation also made it possible for the first time to experiment with other forms of faculty development. One of these was a program of cooperative faculty studies. Its purpose was to encourage and

enable the development of innovative academic programs by interdisciplinary study and dialogue. In the first year of Mellon funding, a member of the faculty submitted a proposal for an extensive curricular project. Its thrust was to improve the teaching of several courses designed to fulfill the College's core requirement of a senior seminar in faith, learning and values. Upon evaluation, the project was judged to have the highest priority within the College for cooperative faculty study. It was obvious, however, that its magnitude was so great that it would require an inordinate fraction of Mellon monies to adequately do what was proposed. As a consequence, members of the academic administration and interested faculty prepared a proposal which was submitted to the Lilly Endowment. A grant of $74,150 was subsequently awarded to the College to fund several summer workshops and provide released time to faculty for course development. Because of the history of positive experiences with summer grants, they were made a vital component of the Lilly program in order to encourage faculty to direct their scholarly and pedagogical efforts toward the improvement of the content and teaching of Senior Seminar.

The average summer grant increased from $450 in 1974 to $1,100 in the five-year interval in which the Mellon and Lilly funds were available. The resources committed to summer grants grew from $8,500 in 1974 when only 19 persons received awards to $43,407 in 1979 when 41 persons received support. The total number of persons (unduplicated) receiving summer fellowships/grants from all sources was 108 in the five-year interval. This represents approximately 80% of the full-time faculty. The total resources committed to funding these awards was $179,167.

II. Benefits of a Small-Grants Program to the College and Faculty

The benefits of this program of small summer study grants are virtually uncountable. Although it would be impossible, therefore, to relate all of them here, the principal ones are outlined in what follows.

Enhancement of Faculty Morale

In the past five years the College happily has been able to respond to all requests for summer fellowships which have been judged to be important and legitimate by the faculty development committee (see Section III). It has become quite apparent that the ready availability of small grants which provide a modest summer stipend and program expenses contributes to the enhancement of faculty morale — far out of proportion to the amounts of the awards. This conclusion is based upon the observations of departmental chairpersons, deans, and colleagues; conversations with chief academic officers in other colleges similar to Hope; and the enthusiastic testimonies of grant recipients.

Increased Sophistication in the Art of Writing Proposals

An application was required of aspirants and a final report from awardees. This procedure not only ensured desired accountability but, far more importantly, itself served as a developmental tool.

There was an obvious improvement in the quality of proposals which came in from one year to the next. Although poor proposals were not accepted, on many occasions they were returned to the author for clarification, revision or rewriting. Especially in the early years of the program, deans worked with applicants to sharpen proposals which were unclear in their original form and hence unacceptable to the faculty development committee. The unrelenting insistence that proposals meet standards which would be demanded by outside funding agencies was of immeasurable benefit in developing the faculty to an extent which was not anticipated when the proposals to the Mellon Foundation and the Lilly Endowment were submitted.

Greater Success in Applying for and Obtaining Outside Funding

Partially because of the availability of ample funds and the procedures established for obtaining them, but primarily because of the positive outcomes experienced by the persons who received awards, there has been a marked increase in the number of faculty who have applied successfully for external funding for projects involving teaching and research. This phenomenon is especially obvious in the humanities and social sciences.

Encouragement of Joint Student-Faculty Research

Because of earlier successes in using joint student-faculty research as a medium for faculty development in the natural sciences, the Mellon and Lilly grants made it possible to experiment with the applicability of this technique to other disciplines. As one might have predicted from the similarities in research methodologies, social scientists demonstrated the greatest interest in attempting student-faculty research.

Interest in this component of the program grew slowly. Funds were reserved in the early years of the grant period to be spent in later years should the number of requests increase markedly in the interval. The Provost and Deans expended special efforts in encouraging faculty in areas outside of the natural sciences to apply for these grants. In spite of their efforts, the number of faculty electing to engage in attempting student-faculty research was somewhat disappointing.

It is now apparent that the cultivation of this effort will require a considerably longer time then earlier projected, but Mellon and Lilly funds provided the resources for a good beginning.

Two members of the humanities faculty, when asked by a student to engage in a joint project, initially were skeptical of using such an approach in their field even though it was done routinely in the natural sciences. After being persuaded

to "give it a try," they were very pleasantly surprised — even astounded — to see what this student was able to accomplish in an oral history project. The project eventually led to a National Endowment for the Humanities grant.

There is now a stronger conviction among faculty and academic administration that such projects are beneficial both for faculty development *and* for student learning. Hence strong emphasis will be placed upon them in any future faculty development program at the College.

Assistance in Attracting Outstanding Faculty

The availability of faculty development funds has proven to be extremely helpful in recruiting outstanding teacher/scholars. Although only modest sums have been committed to assist new faculty in bringing their research programs to a stage where the probability of attracting outside funding would be greatly increased, the cost effectiveness of this component has been significant. An investment of approximately $32,000 has resulted to date in grants from external agencies and foundations that exceed $215,000.

General Upgrading of Scholarship

Faculty development funds have had a significant effect in upgrading scholarship in areas other than in the natural sciences. This is obvious from the increased number of books, articles, and papers read at professional meetings. Dr. William Nelsen and Dr. Al Smith, who visited the campus to evaluate the Hope program on behalf of the Association of American Colleges' Faculty Development Project, observed that, in this regard, the program of small grants has "bred a sense of confidence that will likely continue."

III. Administration of the Small Grant Program

The process for announcing and awarding of grants continues to be an important factor in the success of the program.

The chief academic officer of the College (Provost) is principally responsible for the professional development of the faculty. The four divisional deans and the four elected members of the faculty status committee assist him in administering faculty development funds. Together they constitute a committee of nine which reviews all applications for grants.

At the beginning of each spring semester an announcement is sent to faculty, listing grants available for the coming summer and the criteria upon which proposals will be judged. These include: clarity of objectives; estimated ability of the applicant to successfully complete the proposed work; the prospect that the proposed work will lead to additional funding; the estimated magnitude of the contribution to the College through the applicant.

Each member of the review committee receives a copy of every proposal and evaluates it according to the above-stated criteria. Those proposals receiving

uniformly high "marks" are approved with minimal discussion; proposals receiving uniformly low "marks" are similarly rejected. Proposals receiving mixed evaluations are discussed carefully in committee. These procedures work exceedingly well in the sense that they appear to be both efficient and fair.

At the conclusion of each summer, a list of awardees, topics of projects funded, and corresponding amounts awarded is sent to all faculty for information. This procedure not only assists those faculty who wish to apply for a grant in the coming summer, but also serves as another reminder to faculty of the grants which are available.

These same lists are also given to applicants for faculty positions in order to demonstrate the nature and scope of current faculty development programs. More importantly, they demonstrate the magnitude of the College's commitment to the on-going professional development of its faculty.

IV. Summary

In summary, the availability of faculty development funds and especially those designated for small summer grants has had an incalculable impact on Hope College faculty during the past two decades. It has been helpful not only in the development of on-going faculty, but has also been influential in attracting new faculty. The effects have been so far-reaching and so valuable that it is virtually impossible to contemplate the possibility of not maintaining the program at its current level. Drs. Nelsen and Smith of AAC heard from faculty during the course of their evaluation visit that, along with an increase in the "sense of confidence," there has been a simultaneous increase in expectations for the continuance of faculty development activities. The College has a strong commitment to the maintenance of a vital program of faculty development in the years ahead. Because of the great success that has been experienced with the program of small grants, it will undoubtedly be at the core of any future program.

Encouraging Faculty Learning: A Program of Study Leaves

ROBERT T. VOELKEL

We continue to debate about the contribution faculty research makes towards enhancing teaching. Few will assert that there is no improvement of teaching skills traceable to original and professionally recognized investigation. On the contrary, life on the frontiers of an academic discipline is usually deemed essential for preserving a teacher's acuity of mind. Yet one would have to be hopelessly unaware of the day-to-day problems teachers and students face communicating and appropriating knowledge to declare that success in research automatically produces success in teaching.

Perhaps the problem lingers because our methods of training new faculty are better designed to enhance research than teaching skills. Graduate students are socialized into a disciplinary guild of scholars. They are taught to write in a genre accepted by the guild, and, when they graduate into teaching positions they must publish for their scholarly peers. If they have ambitions for grants and fellowships, they face review committees drawn from the ranks of the guild and comfortable with standards congenial to the academic profession. Should governmental agencies or independent funding authorities make awards, the interests of the academic guilds will be supplemented by other interests, but it is the rare case when students define them.

Of course, there are students and students. The undergraduate student has a variety of intellectual interests which at best only overlap by a thin margin those of the professional guilds. Students preparing for careers in law and medicine or for further study in business schools can have needs and preferences quite different from their fellows who have begun to enter the socialization process completed in graduate school. Other students may capitalize on the breadth of undergraduate study in careers they choose or happen into after leaving college. The variety of undergraduate student interests makes for that multiform world familiar to most of us who operate in predominantly undergraduate institutions.

Teaching effectively means entering the world of students armed with knowledge and skills learned in disciplinary guilds. It is unfortunate that the

---

Robert T. Voelkel is Vice President and Dean of the College, Pomona College, Claremont, California.

only orientation faculty members have to the student world comes from the memory of their own undergraduate days. Thus, it is rather amazing that undergraduate teaching is as successful as it is. However, an alternative mode of faculty preparation is normally rejected: teaching how to teach. Most faculty members will choose training in the guilds of the academic profession over training in education, and I believe they are right; they are not merely captive to the socialization process they have gone through. Important as skills in communication are, important as knowledge of the learning process is, important as it may be to develop sensitivity to life situations in which undergraduate students find themselves, important as motivation and reinforcement are, they are all dwarfed, in my opinion, by the power of ideas. It is still the content of knowledge which provides the energy for the entire academic enterprise.

This argument suggests that among other objectives faculty development ought to encourage faculty members to venture outside areas of specialization and outside their own professional disciplines. It ought to make faculty members more like students,learning new things in new ways. One need not expect discontinuities. Presumably most faculty members enjoy their fields. Thus, we might expect them to venture first into adjacent fields and into subject matter suggested by graduate educations. But we should expect them to try out new ways of thinking about, formulating, and solving problems. And we should expect them to invent new ways of writing. In short, we ought to expect ideas to reshape the professorial intellect.

Faculty development so conceived is the aim of a program of study leaves for faculty at Pomona College which has been supported by a grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.

For many years, Pomona College has offered to faculty the opportunity for sabbatical leaves. Taken either in the seventh year or the seventh semester, these leaves have been funded only to half salary (save for one semester, seventh year leaves). The incentive to secure additional funding has led faculty to apply for grants in national competition. Leaves without pay are also available for those who can gain total support from outside agencies. The program of study leaves was designed to supplement the regular program and to broaden the perspectives on faculty learning. Although in certain cases study leaves were arranged adjacent to sabbatical leaves, both the definition of the study leave and its administration by faculty peers made it clear that study leaves and ordinary sabbaticals for research were different and distinct. Moreover, the study leave did not preempt the sabbatical leave nor delay eligibility.

Study leaves intended, in the words of the grant request, "to enable faculty members to enlarge their areas of expertise, to extend their range of knowledge within a field, or to explore a new field." In order to underscore the purpose of study leaves, applications had to specify where the faculty member planned to study and in what sort of program. In order not to be limited only to established programs, the committee screening applications asked for the designation of a

"mentor" with whom the faculty member would be working. Often participation in graduate seminars was in order. Faculty members were made aware that experiences off the campus in which they were accountable to fellow learners were paramount. Moreover, applicants had to specify the kind of curricular "pay off" the college might look forward to after one returned from a study leave. In my view, these requirements brought faculty learning more into congruence with student learning and directed us, at least, to the perspectives on faculty development I have tried to outline.

When the program was offered to faculty in the spring of 1976, response developed gradually. As might be expected, some lead time in planning both personal and professional lives is necessary for faculty to be able to respond to a new opportunity. Plans originally called for two awards in each of three years. Since the committee awarding the grants wished to keep faith with the first applicants and since the number of applications grew over the three years, we actually made more awards than originally planned. In two cases, awards were made but the study leave was delayed to accommodate individual and departmental needs.

Applications for study leaves came from all ranks of the faculty, from those who apply for every kind of grant available as well as from those who had applied for none in recent years. Those who had been waiting for this sort of opportunity applied as well as those stimulated to consider it by the opportunity itself. Members of the committee awarding the grants represented those who wished to support only younger faculty, those who stuck to the letter of the law and insisted upon evidence of curricular payoff, and those eager to be as flexible as possible. As dean, I insisted on signing off at the end on all the awards. In some instances, members of the committee and I worked with faculty members in rewriting applications in order to help each applicant make the strongest case possible. The results were an interesting and diverse set of awards.

Five of the eight faculty members successful in applying for the study leaves have completed the semester's study. In these cases, we can report the actual study done.

1. An assistant professor of art was given a grant to study the phenomenon of color with a psychologist who specializes in visual perception. The intent was to investigate the relationship between pictorial representation and our perception of the world. Once the study was underway, it led into the complex areas relating language and vision in retrieving information from pictures. Studio art and experimental psychology were brought together in a unique way. The curricular aspect of this project was to be a new perspective on teaching an introductory course.

2. An associate professor of government, whose specialty is constitutional law, studied organizational theory and public administration, enrolling in two quarters of graduate seminars. He wrote papers and delivered a report in the seminars and went further with his mentor in independent study. His intention

was not only to enhance his approach to public law in American government but to prepare himself for a wider range of courses using economics, social psychology, and public administration.

3. An associate professor of English spent his semester on study leave in an advanced acting course and a directing course. In addition, he acted and directed in two plays at his host university. The intention of this study program was to help break down the barrier between theatrical and literary approaches to drama. It plunged a classroom teacher into the studio role of student-actor and director.

4. An assistant professor of classics and classical philosophy applied to the study leave program for a semester at the American School of Classical Studies in Greece to study classical archaeology. While living in Greece, he worked on modern Greek as well. Pomona College has an ambitious study abroad program including so-called "field tutorials" during which faculty members accompany a group of students on a semester abroad. This study has enabled him to survey sites which will be visited in the future by a field tutorial in Greece.

5. A professor of chemistry seeking both to redirect his research and to open new fields for teaching studied in a university program of environmental sciences and engineering and visited laboratories where research in environmental chemistry and biology was underway. His interest was coordinated with political and advisory activities in the whole area of pollution. His intention is to strengthen and enlarge current offerings in environmental chemistry, and at least two joint research projects in organic and biochemistry now will be written into grant requests. Involvement in a budding program of public policy studies at Pomona College should also result.

Three additional study leaves have been approved for the next three semesters.

1. A professor of philosophy whose special interests have been in moral and political philosophy will be away from the campus studying economics. The expansion of a field of personal intellectual interest coincides with discussions in the faculty of an interdisciplinary program in philosophy, politics, and economics.

2. A professor of English, whose major teaching and research have been in 18th century literature, will be studying art history of the 18th and 19th centuries. He is especially interested in knowing the methodology used by the art historian. Not only does he foresee enrichment of aspects of his courses which consider the art and architecture of the 18th century, he also wishes in the future to participate in interdisciplinary courses which take seriously the methodological specialties of two different fields.

3. An assistant professor of government will be spending a semester in Paris examining relations between legislative and executive branches of the present French government. She has worked in comparative government but has dealt

primarily with English government in the past. She also will move from more quantitative approaches to interview methods. Her mentor will introduce her to the French political science community. Her contributions to Pomona College's active international relations program should be enriched.

I believe it is clear that the study leave program did provide an important supplement to the regular leave program of Pomona College and that it did encourage faculty learning in areas which will enrich teaching. It did stimulate faculty members to return in some measure to the student world, and it provided opportunities to stray outside the boundaries of disciplines the professional guilds lay down. It is my hope that new research will also result from these study leaves and that the traditional disciplines may also reap some benefit.

Obviously a small portion of the faculty has been involved in the study leave program. It is also true that some time will be necessary before an assessment of the full impact of these leaves on the individual faculty members and on the college can be made. It will be difficult in any case to trace direct effects. Nevertheless, the diversity of projects and the evidence of ingenious connections of various areas of human learning bear some witness to how members of an excellent faculty can respond to the challenge the study leave program presented. Our experience argues for more flexibility in makings funds for faculty learning available and for standards of evaluation less focused on traditional research.

A cursory glance at the particular programs supported at Pomona College shows that natural scientists were less heavily involved than social scientists and humanists. That ought not to be surprising since in science the research enterprise still dominates both faculty activity and teaching. We tend to look for student involvement in faculty research as the culmination of the undergraduate experience for those specializing in natural science. Nevertheless, the day may come when the professional opportunities for graduates in natural science will lead them into business and public policy arenas and then faculty learning will probably assume a different character.

In the end, Pomona College's program of faculty development in the form of study leaves reinforces the conviction that ideas drive the system of higher education. We believe we serve our faculty, and ultimately our students, best when we encourage them to find new sources for ideas and new contexts in which to explore them.

Retraining and Renewing Faculty in a Time of Retrenchment

ZEDDIE BOWEN

We take for granted the general value of an effective faculty development program in the regular maintenance of intellectual vitality and curriculum relevance in higher education. During times of declining resources and faculty retrenchment, a well planned faculty development program may take on even greater value as a means of responding to both institutional needs to redistribute faculty resources, and faculty needs for continued professional development.

Such was the case in 1975 at Beloit College, a small liberal arts college which has long offered a distinctive and high quality undergraduate education.

Like many other liberal arts colleges, Beloit encountered serious economic problems during the early 1970's. Inflationary pressures combined with declines in enrollment had serious impact on the college's financial situation. With a limited endowment, the college was excessively dependent on tuition for its operating budget. A familiar set of cost cutting decisions inevitably followed, the most significant of which was the reduction in the number of faculty members by twenty percent between 1974 and 1976. A similar situation is likely to be encountered by many small independent colleges in the 1980's.

In anticipation of the problems created by major faculty retrenchment and a period of limited resources, Beloit initiated a successful faculty development program that achieved significant retraining of a number of continuing faculty members for new teaching responsibilities and maintenance of a high level of professional renewal and creativity among the faculty. The program was funded in 1976 by a three-year grant of $200,000 from a national foundation. The lessons learned from the program may be especially useful to institutions facing similar problems in the next decade.

The needs recognized by the college in the program were divided into four categories:

1. A systematic program of revitalization and scholarly development on the part of our faculty to permit them to keep abreast of the growth of knowledge in their disciplines;

Zeddie Bowen is Provost at Beloit College, Beloit, Wisconsin.

2. A program for the retraining of selected faculty who because of the reductions in faculty size are required to teach courses outside their areas of competence;
3. A program to enable certain faculty to undertake administrative responsibilities at the college; and
4. Support for the faculty of five selected departments to study the relationship between their disciplines and career opportunities in today's world.

The impact of the overall program, especially in revitalization and retraining, on individual faculty and on the college has been substantial. A few examples of the different ways the development funds were used to achieve the goals of the first two categories will illustrate the nature of the program.

1. Scholarly Development

A grant for scholarly development to an economics professor allowed him to spend two and one-half months at the Center for Study of Public Choice at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, three days at the capitol in Washington, D.C., and three weeks at a summer institute on "Ethical Issues in Management" at Yale University.

At the Center for Study of Public Choice he was able to read, attend regular seminars and a three-day conference on utilitarian ethics for philosophers who have a public choice perspective, gain an understanding of the points of view of several extremely demanding, precise and original thinkers at the Center, and write a paper on "Collective Rationality and Political Process." The experience contributed importantly to the vitality of his courses in Public Finance and Politics, Economics and Welfare. The three days in Washington were spent interviewing resource people and collecting government documents related to a research project involving an analysis of the issues in legislatures which are typically disposed by vote-trading. The institute for "Ethical Issues in Management" brought several important benefits: practice in using simulation games, and the case study method (using cases which were described as instructive, provocative, and best of all fun), and exeriencing new perspectives provided by persons in religious studies and social ethics as well as practicing managers. Many new viewpoints will find their way into his courses. He concluded his report at the end of the summer succinctly, "I thought I accomplished at least a year's worth of professional growth." The total grant amounted to $1,527.

Another scholarly development grant was used by a photographer from the Art Department to pursue his study of the history of Hungarian photography. A Hungarian native, he had begun by studying the origins and early national influences on several Hungarian natives who have played significant roles in the history of western photography. The grant allowed him to spend time in the library of the Hungarian Photoartists Association working with original sources and journals, including material from Hungarian speaking Transylvania, and to study the large collections of photographs at the Museum of

Contemporary History (Museum of the Labor Movement). He was also able to interview two dozen Hungarian photographers, photo-journal editors and historians for perspectives on the history of the art unavailable in official publications. Access to original sources and personal interviews proved to be even more essential for good scholarship than is ordinarily the case because of the long-term and diverse constraints on intellectual freedom in Hungary and their effect on artistic expression. Several papers, including one on contemporary Hungarian photography, are in preparation along with a definitive history.

These two examples supported from the first category, one emphasizing professional growth in an academic setting, the other a scholarly mission in a less accessible setting, are typical of what is normally supported under faculty development programs.

2. Retraining Faculty

The goal of the second category of grants was quite different. For them the aim was to prepare individuals for very specific new classroom responsibilities. Each of the examples that follows was different in scope and pattern of development. For most, the retraining was for a new course or two within the general area of previous training of the individual faculty member. A few involved more extensive retooling. In a number of cases, faculty development funds allowed a reduction in teaching load, and paid for tuition and some travel and living expenses required in the retraining activities.

Reduction in the number of the Religious Studies faculty required a shift in teaching responsibilities of those remaining. One individual trained in biblical studies and hermeneutics was asked to prepare to teach courses in World and Comparative Religions, areas in which he had no previous teaching experience. A modest faculty development grant allowed him to be given released time from some teaching to travel regularly to the University of Wisconsin in Madison fifty miles away to work with a specialist in south Asian religions. In an informal guided reading/tutorial arrangement, he was able to learn the methods of comparative study of religions as well as to study specific religions of south Asia: Hinduism, Buddhaism, Jainism as well as Christianity and Judaism in the south Asian setting. An additional grant will allow him to take formal course work in Sanskrit to further broaden his background for a new teaching role in his department.

In a similar fashion, an associate professor of sociology took formal courses in order to teach Methods and Statistics in Sociology, and an assistant professor of mathematics retrained to take on the teaching of Statistics for the Mathematics Department. Language instructors were supported in bringing their level of proficiency in a second or third language up to the level required for them to teach new courses. Grants included funds for formal course work at other institutions as well as for foreign travel to work with native speakers.

For many faculty members the need for retraining was more limited. Short courses, workshops and seminars provided many specialized opportunities for

those faculty members to upgrade their knowledge of subjects newly acquired in their teaching responsibilities. Short courses were especially popular for the science faculty. A sample of those attended were on: Optics, Industrial Organic Chemistry, Thinlayer Chromatography, Organic Synthesis, Recombinant DNA, and Toxicology.

By these relatively small adjustments in teaching responsibilities, important courses were not lost from the curriculum with the faculty reduction. For some others, retraining required more time and commitment.

Retraining in both English and Education allowed an instructor in English to meet the needs of two departments and make a full-time appointment out of a half-time position in each department. Supported by grants to enroll in summer school courses at the University of Wisconsin, she was able to retrain to teach a course in Chaucer for the English Department, a subject she had not studied since graduate school in 1949, and to enroll in graduate level courses in the Teaching of Reading in Secondary School and Supervision to assume those responsibilities for the Education Department. Although she was a certified high school teacher with experience in teaching reading, she had no graduate level credentials. Over a period of three summers she was able to complete the courses required for her new teaching roles. Already a popular and effective teacher, there was the added bonus of fresh enthusiasm that frequently comes with experience as a student in someone else's classroom.

For several faculty members good use was also made in combining grants for faculty development with regular sabbatical leave. For example, the chairman of the Education Department used his sabbatical to enroll in courses in order to gain certification as a special education teacher, specifically to learn to teach the emotionally disturbed and the educable mentally retarded. Changes in that field have been so great in recent years that a major commitment of time was required on his part. The development grant covered tuition and fees plus some of the expenses of taking part in the program. An unusual special benefit from his experience was that he did the required student teaching in a local school in which he had served as the supervisor of Beloit College student teachers. That experience gave him new perspectives on student teaching and it gave practicing teachers in the school a new perspective on him.

Different types of problems are faced by faculty members who move in and out of administration especially if the time spent in administration away from teaching is long. A senior administrator returning to teaching after more than a decade of administrative responsibility received a grant to support part of his retraining to teach courses in sociology. The specific courses for which he retooled were in Political Sociology, Industrial Sociology and an interdisciplinary course on Equality. The grant allowed him to spend a month in England primarily at the London School of Economics. In the course of his stay he was able to catch up on literature published by English authors on social stratification and the political and economic structures of England, as well as

attend both the Labor Party Conference in Blackpool and the Conservative Party Conference in Brighton, and interview members of parliament, members of the Labor government, sociologists and political scientists. Reentry into the classroom then occurred with a fresh exposure to current issues and current thinking.

These examples are only a few of the many retraining and renewal projects supported by the program. A total of ninty-eight grants, averaging $1,600, were made during the three years of foundation funding. The major impact on the college has been the successful reassignment of course and curriculum responsibilities to the continuing faculty and the maintenance of a professionally lively faculty during a period of scarce institutional resources. As a result of the past three years of faculty development activities, there is little need for additional retraining at this time. On the other hand, scholarly development awards continue to be made on a more limited scale from regular college funds.

Why has the program been successful at Beloit? Several factors can be cited. First, and perhaps most important, there was clear understanding on the part of the faculty of the financial conditions leading to faculty retrenchment. Information was openly shared to avoid misunderstandings about motives and goals. As a result, there was responsible, even though painful, involvement of the faculty in retrenchment decisions. Thus, the responsibilities of the continuing faculty members to make adjustments in courses and topics taught in the curriculum were generally recognized and accepted.

Second, there is an intangible quality at Beloit College of collegiality and congeniality. There is a genuine dedication to the college and to colleagues and a willingness to help. Without it the program's success would have been more limited.

Third, once a set of guidelines had been established for judging proposals for funding, three respected members of the faculty served as a screening board for applications. Encouragement to faculty members to seek retraining or renewal support came principally from within individual departments where program needs were most easily recognized, not from the college's administration.

Fourth, the college resisted the temptation to use the funds to offset regular expenses or to supplement faculty salaries. The impact of the funds was thus directly on the retraining and renewal activities rather than on the individuals.

A final factor of significance to the success of the program was the focus placed on reasonable retraining. No attempt was made to retrain faculty members in fields totally unrelated to their previous experience. Where there are serious imbalances in the number of faculty members in unrelated departments, retraining may not be the best solution to that problem. When the scope of retraining is limited and goals concrete and specific, success is more likely to be attained, and the benefits to the individual and the college directly measurable — a course or subject can be taught that previously could not.

Renewing Faculty Through Faculty Growth Planning

R. JUDSON CARLBERG

An alternative to traditional faculty development models is found in the professional growth plan used since 1974 at Gordon College in Wenham, Massachusetts. Rather than assigning responsibilities for faculty development to a center or requiring all faculty to attend a series of developmental workshops, Gordon College has encouraged each faculty person to design and implement voluntarily his or her own action plan for growth.

The program was stimulated by common conditions which emerged in higher education in the early seventies. No longer were professors able to find professional challenges simply by moving to a new campus. As enrollment growth slackened, colleges and universities slowed the pace of new faculty recruitment. These circumstances often provided a grim prospect to the full professor, age forty, who looked at twenty-five more years of teaching and realized that few challenges like promotion and tenure were ahead. Harold Hodgkinson suggested that faculty growth contracts might be one remedy for those in this dilemma (Hodgkinson, 1974: 270).

These steady state staffing patterns had negative implications for institutions as well. No longer was new blood being transfused into institutional veins. To meet these conditions and to encourage continuing improvement in the teaching process, many institutions established collective faculty development programs which encompassed workshops, seminars, guest speakers and other group activities. Unfortunately, these traditional models of faculty development were not always designed to meet the perceived needs of faculty (Milley, 1978). Institutional priorities were usually of major concern. When faculty needs were met, this was a fortunate coincidence. While common ground often was found between the institution and the individual, little attention was paid to the faculty member who wished to strike out in creative directions of development.

Recent research on adult development by Daniel Levinson of Yale University confirms that men at mid-life may seek to change in ways which do not

---

R. Judson Carlberg is Dean of the Faculty and Director of Faculty Development at Gordon College, Wenham, Massachusetts

exactly parallel the directions taken by institutions of which they are a part. Levinson reports (Levinson, 1978: 31):

> Often a man who has accomplished his goals comes to feel trapped: his success is meaningless and he is now caught with a stultifying situation. Many men find their lives relatively satisfactory in some respects and disappointing or destructive in others. Whatever his life condition, every man in the early forties needs to sort things out, come to terms with the limitations and consider the next steps in the journey.

Faculty growth plans as conceived and implemented at Gordon College provide an orderly approach to the sorting out process and to focusing on the future. Not only are they helpful to the adult in mid-life, they also provide structure to the youthful assistant professor who, in Levinson's terms, is "forming and living out the dream" (Levinson, 1978: 91).

As faculty develop with the support of growth plans, they often impact positively on their campuses. Richard Gross, Gordon College's President and the originator of the growth plan concept at the college, has concluded that a climate of expectancy, a sense of movement and vigor, and a vibrant faculty can be established and maintained in a program with goal directed growth (Gross, 1976: 74-79). His optimism is founded upon fact. After Jane Milley conducted research on the Gordon program, she concluded that, although she could not declare the program a success (after its first year of operation), "an overarching optimism pervades even those reports that are negative" (Milley, 1977: 192-193).

Evolution of Growth Plans

Initially, Gross, who was serving as Dean of the Faculty at Gordon College in 1974, proposed to several senior faculty that they voluntarily write growth plans as an experiment in professional development. The plans covered one year, contained a self assessment, a statement of current institutional responsibilities, an outline of specific annual goals and a means of evaluating whether goals had been achieved at the end of the plan.

The pilot group and the Dean first wrote and distributed their plans to all faculty. After one year of implementation, they discussed the results of their efforts with their colleagues and invited others to join them in a second year of individual growth planning.

In 1976, with the added help of a four year grant from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation of Battle Creek, Michigan, the program enrolled seventy-five percent of the Gordon faculty on a voluntary basis. Gross, who was appointed Gordon's President early in 1976, turned over leadership for the program to a group of five faculty selected by their colleagues to serve on the Faculty Development Committee. This group revised and expanded the program's structure and goals while maintaining the essential components used in the first pilot effort. A new Dean of the Faculty joined the college in mid 1976 and

became Director of the program. He worked closely with the Faculty Development Committee to bring about full implementation. Annually, since its inception, the program has attracted approximately seventy-five percent participation of the faculty. Of those who have been on the campus since 1976, all have volunteered to participate at least once, and many have been involved for all four years.

The Renewal Process

Each participant constructs two major documents in the first year of involvement. The first is a faculty profile which assesses present strengths and weaknesses, outlines current institutional and community responsibilities and broadly states five year projections for growth. This assessment stimulates a faculty person to look at her professional life in the larger context of total life commitments. It also becomes the basis for a discussion with the Dean of the Faculty on matters of specific interest to the participant's welfare. The profile is not rewritten for five years but becomes foundational for all individual plans.

The second document written by the faculty member is the individual development plan, an annual statement of goals which relates in a more precise sense to the general projections contained in the profile. Not only does the faculty member specify these goals, but she also stipulates how she will attempt to accomplish these goals, how she will assess progress toward her goal fulfillment and how much funding, if any, each goal will require. In addition, each participant proposes her own support group or advisory committee which serves in a mentoring role, providing encouragement, new insights and evaluative comments. Advisory committees may consist of faculty peers, community resource people, students, alumni or colleagues from nearby campuses. Finally, the individual development plan contains an outline of procedures to be used for monitoring progress throughout the coming year.

Each individual development plan is submitted to the Faculty Development Committee which consists of faculty elected from the ranks of the college's divisions. Two readers from the committee carefully scrutinize plans assigned to them, make recommendations for changes to the writer and then present final plans to their colleagues on the committee for funding approval. Having completed these tasks, the Faculty Development Committee then awaits the results of each year-long effort.

Reasons for General Acceptance

Although a few problems have been encountered along the way to full implementation, these have been comparatively minor when considered against the backdrop of success. Why has the program been widely accepted at Gordon College and elsewhere?

Faculty Ownership — The faculty has been integrally involved in the program's leadership since 1974. Faculty first established the program's guide-

lines, then wrote the program manual and later contributed substantially to the grant writing process. As the program evolved, they decided the amounts of funding for each grant and accepted responsibility for evaluating their peer's productivity. In short, they committed time and professional expertise to what they perceived to be their program.

Administrative Support — The President and the Dean of the Faculty not only encouraged faculty leadership to emerge, but also demonstrated support in tangible ways. They sought special outside funding to assist with the institution's portion of the budget. Most of the central administration has written administrative growth plans annually. Finally, the President committed the college to continue funding once outside support has ceased.

Voluntary Participation — Faculty members have not been coerced into participation. If a person perceived that the program would fill a need, she was encouraged to apply. No penalty existed for failure to submit a plan.

Non-Threatening Evaluation — The Faculty Development Committee initially decided not to turn the individual results of the program automatically over to the faculty Senate for use in promotion and tenure deliberations. Rather, each participant was given the right to decide what, if anything, from his faculty development file would be forwarded to the personnel files. In fact, most faculty voluntarily chose to submit the products of their plans to the Senate. On the other hand, very few selected committee evaluations of their products for inclusion. In no case has the Senate considered failure to complete a faculty development goal in the negative when making promotion and tenure recommendations.

Individualized Approach — Faculty members were encouraged to develop their skills as academic advisors, department heads, committee members, researchers and teachers. Beyond this, they were challenged to set creative and innovative goals which went beyond the usual professional activities. Plans were always tied to individual needs first; institutional priorities were second.

Climate of Trust — Participants functioned in an atmosphere of openness and trust which allowed the discussion of limitations as well as strengths. A common bond of concern for each participant's welfare was forged as faculty advisory committees reviewed development plans, offered suggestions for implementation and improvement and finally evaluated degrees of fulfillment.

Sense of Accomplishment — By committing goals for growth to writing, faculty have found that their intentions are much more likely to be carried out. This confirms a basic principle uncovered by the research of psychologist Paul Secord (1977: 270-271).

> The weakest commitment is a mere statement of intention without an action plan. Action plans consist of a contemplated series of actions by which the individual means to carry out his intentions. They may be simple or they may be elaborate schemes consisting of a series of sub plans. . . .

Without the formation of an action plan, execution may be impossible because many actions require planning or preparation. No action plan, or an incomplete action, may result in failure to carry out the commitment.

In annual review, faculty who have successfully completed a significant portion of their annual individual development plans reflected with a sense of personal satisfaction upon their accomplishments.

Institutional Reward System — Faculty are judged on a broad range of competencies when being considered for promotion and tenure. They have the option of matching their growth plans to the college reward system. Growth plans may be used to enhance skills and abilities in areas perceived by faculty to be weak. Nothing is mandated. Of course, most realize that their chances for professional advancement may increase if they parallel some faculty development productivity to institutional reward measures.

Results

Have faculty been renewed through the program? An absolute answer cannot be given. However, Milley's research results seem to indicate that faculty are pleased with their progress. When queried both verbally and via written survey, participants expressed satisfaction with their professional growth. They were asked to respond to a series of statements by either agreeing, disagreeing or expressing uncertainty. Here are the selected results (Heie, 1979: 33):

Table: Summary of Attitudes of Participants Toward Growth Potential in Program (N=38)

Statement	*Agree*	*Disagree*	*Uncertain or No Opinion*
Program is satisfying and should continue	92%	3%	5%
I received adequate funding	92%	3%	5%
Program has impacted positively on Gordon	95%	—	5%
My participation has been important to my development	79%	16%	5%
Program has not been flexible enough	8%	87%	5%
Program has helped me define my goals	82%	13%	5%
I have done things I would not otherwise	92%	—	8%

Other indicators are beginning to emerge which point to the program's positive impact.

Students are reaping direct benefit from the broadened experiences to which their faculty now have access. For the first time, students are talking of creative

new courses, new books, new research projects and broader learning opportunities which exist because of the faculty growth program. Student evaluations of teaching have given higher marks to some faculty who concentrated on instructional improvement.

Some faculty report personal benefit from the self assessment in their mid-life experiences. A few feel that the program has helped them strike out on new avenues of professional experimentation.

Finally, as a result of the mentoring relationships which spring up in some advisory committees, faculty report that a mutual sense of community has begun to develop beyond existing collegial relationships. The dynamics of the advisory committee are varied but several important themes have emerged. When careful selection of advisory committee members has taken place, participants find their colleagues on the committees often provide expertise in areas of weakness. Even when friends have been selected to serve in the mentoring relationship, communication has been strengthened. Friends often provide honest, open, frank and non-threatening observations and, when serving as mentors, will care enough to confront.

Faculty serving as advisory committee members or mentors expect not only to share their knowledge with participants, but also to learn from the participants. Older faculty learn from younger colleagues concerning new research methods, new ways to relate to students and the latest applications of computers to the discipline. Cross fertilization of ideas occurs when members of several disciplines serve each other in a mentoring role. The faculty development framework encourages participants to talk of little discussed issues not otherwise addressed in the regular flow of campus communication.

The results of such relationships are obvious. Faculty members feel rewarded when they broaden a colleague's outlook on a discipline related problem or a certain style of pedagogy. Natural barriers often created between disciplines or departments begin to melt as a result of cross fertilization of ideas and attitudes of mutual support.

Conclusion

For many faculty at Gordon College, faculty growth planning has been a means of providing renewal in an era of tight budgets and low turnover. The faculty growth planning concept is applicable in many different settings. However, each institution must wrestle with its own ethos before attempting to adapt concepts found successful at Gordon College. Implementation of the Gordon model in another campus climate may lead to dismal failure. If an institution and its faculty are willing to assess institutional needs, to apply appropriate growth planning principles within the campus context, and to agree that all must be encouraged to develop, then growth planning holds the potential for infusing new blood into faculty performance.

References

Gross, Richard F. "Faculty Growth Contracts," *Educational Horizons*, (Vol. 55,2, Winter, 1976), pp. 74-79.

Heie, Sweet and Carlberg. *Professional Development Through Growth Contracts: A Handbook*. (Gordon College, Wenham, Mass., 1979), p. 33.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. "Faculty Reward and Assessment Systems." *Educational Record*. (Vol. 55,4, Fall, 1974), p. 270.

Levinson, Daniel J. *The Seasons of a Man's Life*. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978), p. 31.

Milley, Jane E. "Redirecting Staff Development: Individual Development Plans," A paper presented to the League for Innovation, National Conference, (Sacramento, October 23-25, 1978.)

Milley, Jane E. *A Case Study Approach to the Evaluation of a Faculty Development Program Which Uses Individual Development Plans*. Ph.D. Dissertation (unpublished), (Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y., 1977), pp. 192-193.

Secord, Paul F. "Making Oneself Behave," in Theodore Mischel (ed.), *The Self: Psychological and Philosophical Issues*. (Tolowa, N.J.: Rowan and Littlefield, 1977), pp. 270-271.

The Teaching Consultant at Earlham

GERALD R. BAKKER AND PAUL A. LACEY

A faculty development program can only succeed if it grows out of and expresses a general institutional consensus about what is important. Several years ago, advertising a position, one department at Earlham offered a single-sentence description of the College ethos: "Earlham is a teach-or-perish institution." The description is accurate. Though there is, and will continue to be, substantial debate on such matters as what constitutes effective teaching and the relation of effective teaching to scholarly activities and disciplinary commitments, there is general consensus that excellence in teaching should be the *sine qua non* for remaining on the faculty.

That consensus has a long history. For many years the Earlham faculty has been active in generating educational experiments, new programs and new ways to teach long-standing ones. In the 1950's and 1960's Earlham science faculty were active in national programs to design new high school curricula in Biology, Chemistry and Physics, while on campus, faculty from many disciplines were designing programmed instruction units for their courses. More recently, faculty have been engaged in experiments in cross-disciplinary and team-taught courses, experiential learning in internships, off-campus programs and wilderness programs. And now we plan for computer-assisted and self-paced learning in many disciplines. For most of us, the test of research, experimentation, and writing is whether they enhance the teaching-learning process for undergraduate students.

Given such general agreement, it is appropriate that Earlham College's activities in support of faculty development should focus on a variety of means to elevate the importance of teaching. Like many other institutions, Earlham began to give greater attention to issues of teaching effectiveness in the early 1970's. By that time, the faculty was requiring student evaluation of every course each term, so we were beginning to get a body of student opinion on teaching. That, added to the national concern about "steady-state" faculties in the future, led us to create task forces to consider means of getting better

---

Gerald R. Bakker is Professor of Chemistry and Paul A. Lacey is Professor of English at Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana. Bakker served as Teaching Consultant for the Earlham Faculty during 1975-78; Lacey currently holds that position.

evaluation of teaching and giving greater support for maintaining and improving teaching effectiveness. In the face of widespread assumptions then that "steady-state" faculties, aging professors and stagnation were all the same thing, we were considering ways to organize institutional resources to support good teaching.

Those task forces offered recommendations about both evaluation and support of professional and curricular development. Among the recommendations related to evaluation was one which called for tenured faculty to go through a comprehensive review and self-evaluation of their teaching every five years. The first such reviews began in 1975-76.

Another recommendation led to the allocation, since 1975, of $60,000 a year, out of regular budget, for support of summer stipends and sabbatical and leave supplement. (Sabbaticals themselves are funded from the faculty salary budget.) In addition, at about the same time, the administration allocated a share of foundation grants, from a Ford Venture Grant and from a Mellon Foundation Faculty Development Grant, to a Priorities Committee charged with reviewing and funding proposals for curricular and noncurricular experiments to improve teaching and learning. Faculty could feel that institutional resources as well as catalog rhetoric were dedicated to supporting and improving teaching.

Some of our activities are quite traditional: 1) supporting summer research and writing; 2) supplementing sabbatical and leave support; 3) supporting planning and execution of educational experiments through released time for individuals and groups of faculty; 4) funding on-campus workshops designed by departments, programs or groups of faculty to address such specific teaching-learning problems as how to teach a three-term humanities course required of all freshmen or how to organize a multi-disciplinary core sequence in Human Development and Social Relations.

At least one feature of Earlham's "faculty development" activities — the phrase is not often used by the faculty here — is less common but is particularly appropriate to the College's aims: the appointment of a Consultant on Teaching and Learning. The idea took its beginning from the conviction that good teachers are *made*, not *born*, and that many people can become better teachers if they have the support of colleagues to help them reflect on and experiment with their teaching. In fact, the original proposal was advanced by one senior faculty member who was frustrated at seeing people let go who could have become effective teachers if they had not been left, in the long tradition of the profession, to struggle with their teaching problems in isolation. It is not enough to say Earlham is a teach-or-perish institution; valuing teaching led us to a commitment to help individuals become the best teachers they can.

The idea took further shape in discussions within the Faculty Affairs Committee, and as is often the case in the development of ideas in committee, clear positive statements came out of the rejection of a series of negatives. We were

clear that we were not looking for a clinical psychologist for the faculty. The objective was not counseling teachers on their personal behavior but the improvement of teaching. We were also clear that a focus on learning theory was not the primary goal. We were more practical and more interested in immediate accomplishments. This was not a denial of the value of the research in learning theory or psychological counseling; our immediate goals were more modest and within the range of competence of a number of faculty who could be set free to be good listeners and sympathetic colleagues. Further, we were convinced that the Consultant could not be either an administrator or in any way involved in decision-making about contract renewal or tenure questions.

So we looked for a person from within the faculty who had had some years of successful teaching. We assumed the Consultant should come from within our own faculty for two reasons. First, we wanted someone with experience with the kinds of students we have and with the operation of our curriculum. The similarities among American colleges and universities surely outweigh the differences, yet it seemed important to have a Consultant thoroughly familiar with our way of doing things. Second, it seemed to us that faculty would be more likely to seek counsel and advice from a colleague than from a relative stranger. For this reason, too, we have conceived of the position as half-time and require the Consultant to be teaching the other half of his time. We assumed that there was a level of mutual trust among faculty to permit selecting a Consultant from within the faculty, so long as we also provided careful safeguards for confidentiality. We were working toward the concept of the Consultant as, first of all, someone set free to be the quintessential colleague, and we have found that the particular area of professional expertise — the two who have served so far have been in Chemistry and in English — does not make significant difference.

The process of selecting the Consultant has been fairly long and arduous. Members of Faculty Affairs Committee and Teaching and Learning Committee polled most of the faculty, either singly or in small groups, asking two questions: "Whom would you like to see appointed as Consultant?" and "Would you be willing to consult with the person you suggest?" We were not looking only for someone respected by colleagues; the key question on our minds was whether the Consultant named would actually be sought out by other faculty. The polling process itself helped us solve this problem.

The Committees examined all the names suggested and the comments offered on them and then narrowed the choice to a single person who was then invited to be interviewed by the Committees. After the interview, the Committee made its recommendation to the President of the College, who made the actual appointment. The Consultant was thus not imposed on the faculty by either the administration or a faculty committee.

The first Consultant was named in 1975 and served for three years; the second will finish a two-year appointment in June 1980. After the first consul-

tant had been appointed, funds were sought and obtained from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education. This also involved Earlham in FIPSE's National Project Three — "Elevating the Importance of Teaching" — a valuable experience.

From the beginning it was assumed that the use of the Consultant would be voluntary. There has never been the attitude that poor or struggling teachers could be sent to the Consultant for "shaping-up," nor could the Consultant be "called in" by the Academic Dean to take care of problems. Both in concept and in practice, the Consultant is available and sought out on faculty initiative. It was also assumed that the work of the Consultant would be completely confidential. The Consultant reports nothing except, once a year, the number of people who have come for consultation (which has been, over the four years, between two-thirds and three-fourths of the faculty). The only breakdown in data has been of tenured and non-tenured faculty. The Consultants have spoken of particular problems which have arisen, but never in a way which would allow an individual or even a department to be identified. This protection of confidence was carried further so that the Consultant may not serve on any committee which makes decisions directly affecting the teaching careers of faculty members, for a period of three years after leaving the Consultant's position. Some may think we have gone too far with this self-denying ordinance, but it gives a clear indication how far removed the Consultant is to be from administrative decisions.

The Consultant is *not* a developer, if by that term is meant someone who comes along and improves a piece of waste or undeveloped real estate by putting his or her own impress on it. Ideally, the Consultant should have no agenda except to reflect with the Consultee about teaching, to take the Consultee's perception of need and description of teaching goals as the starting-point for any work. At the risk of seeming to claim too much for ourselves as practitioners, we find it useful to think of the Consultant as fulfilling some of the pastoral functions Academic Deans once could fulfill, before evaluation and judgment became such serious aspects of the Dean's work, and the functions one would expect of an ideal colleague. In practice this has meant visiting and observing many classes, helping to interpret student comments on evaluation forms, providing assessment of how classes or particular teaching strategies worked, engaging in discussion of how the teacher's purposes might best be achieved, working on course design, encouraging faculty to publish or to seek grant support for curricular ideas. It has also meant in practice that the two of us who have thus far held the Consultant's position have given primary attention to *content* questions when observing classes, and that we move from discussing how well we perceive content is being conveyed or grasped *only* if we recognize that the Consultee wants to consider other matters. Though it is a great temptation to earn our salary by telling everything we saw, or by giving a great deal of how-to advice, the consultation is far more effective if we take our

cues from the Consultee and work for clarification of issues with him or her. Because our colleagues generally want it that way, *content* comes before and predominates over *process* questions, but such consultation can also lead on to discussion about personal and professional goals, hopes and doubts about teaching, and a whole range of other personal matters. In all aspects of the consulting, our intention is to be as completely "client-centered," to use a phrase we would never utter in public, as possible.

Much of what we have experienced as Consultants at Earlham would be common on any campus, and it may be useful to comment on a few points. Each of us learned quickly how isolated a teacher really is in the classroom. Even when there is a lot of team-teaching, as at Earlham, most of the teaching we do can be very lonely. Teachers have contact with their students about what happens in class, and they may look to their colleagues for some help, but most of the decisions about content and teaching process are made by one teacher working alone. And the judgments of the students about this teaching is seen by the teacher alone, except when it comes time for decisions about contract renewal or tenure.

All this is not necessarily bad, for teachers are professionals who must make and carry out their decisions on the basis of their training and experience. But many times we found that just talking with a teacher about those decisions brought great relief. Teachers appreciated being able to discuss what they were doing and alternative methods in the low-risk context provided by the promise of confidentiality. The Consultants often did not function as advisor or helper so much as sounding-board, and this is no trivial function, for often teachers have made decisions more readily and with less anxiety than when they had no one to talk to. Many times the Consultants' chief service has been to help break the isolation of the classroom.

We also came to realize how intense the investment of self is in teaching. People have profound ego-involvement in their teaching and are beset by anxieties about doing well. It is easy to understand a teacher's concern about effectiveness after receiving a number of critical evaluations from students. The young teacher in this position sees a whole career threatened, and the older teacher sees the beginning of a slow slide into ineffectuality. But job security is only one factor in such anxiety; faculty generally want to do well at their teaching out of integrity more than from desire to keep a job. To be teaching poorly and not to know what to do about it is a kind of hell.

Even the most successful teachers are deeply concerned about the quality of their teaching. It may even be true that sensitivity to implied or actual criticism is directly proportional to how good a teacher's reputation is. With excellent teachers, the Consultants found that making a comment which would be construed as even slightly critical could have serious effects. We found ourselves sometimes offering what we perceived to be constructive comments to superior teachers and then working around discouraged spirits for the next half

hour. Imagine what the experience is like with less-successful faculty. This part of being a Consultant was not the most enjoyable, but each of us experienced it a number of times. And the deep self-investment of faculty in their training generates the satisfying consequence that even a small amount of help produces a great deal of result.

When we describe the work of the Faculty Consultant on Teaching and Learning at Earlham, a common reaction is that such an idea would *only* work at a small place, or where teaching is already highly-valued, or at a church-related college, or at a Quaker college. There are undoubtedly kinds of places where such a position has a better chance of succeeding, and places where it would fail. A Consultant, in the absence of any other support for improving teaching, will make little impact. We believe, however, that many places can modify the idea of the Consultant to fit their own institutional needs and ways of operating. We believe it to be generally true that faculty teach in isolation and that they want to do well out of a sense of integrity and commitment to the teaching-learning enterprize. We also believe that people can get only limited help in improving teaching in a context which emphasizes judgment and evaluation alone. If teaching can be *taught*, as is true of every other art, devices which legitimize talking about teaching — as opposed to bragging or lamenting about one's last class — can help raise awareness of teaching issues and can lead to better because more reflective teaching. One way to encourage such discussion is to appoint someone to serve as an "ideal colleague" to work with faculty, on their initiative and their agenda, to improve teaching.

The Teaching/Learning Center: Encouraging Faculty to Share Ideas

BARBARA HELLING AND ERLING JORSTAD

The Teaching/Learning Center at St. Olaf College was established as a "visible, physical and programmatic gathering together of the resources — human, literary, and technical — which can be used to improve the teaching/learning process at St. Olaf College." The idea for such a comprehensive faculty development program at the school, above and beyond the support already provided by sabbatical leaves, professional travel and similar programs, emerged from the decision to have ready by the time of the college's Centennial year, 1974, a full review of its academic aims and plans for the future. Hence, in 1972 a self-study was started by faculty and administration to prepare such a document. One of the key committees was the Improvement of Teaching Task Force which through released time and summer planning, submitted a proposal for support of teaching development to the Lilly Foundation.

The initial planning came from the Dean, who drafted a preliminary proposal based on the gathered research. Then additional suggestions were solicited and received from the Task Force, the standing Review and Planning Committee, and division and department chairpersons. The proposal had two major features: funding for faculty-initiated projects for professional development and improvement of teaching, and, second, the establishment of a Teaching/Learning Center to be directed by four part-time Associates representing a variety of expertise on campus. This proposal included several features: the establishment of a seminar-reading room, and the presentation of information on the processes of teaching and learning through seminars, workshops, and discussions. The proposal also asked for support for technological improvement of instruction.

In the Spring of 1975 Lilly granted St. Olaf $123,000 for two years, of which approximately one half was designed for the staffing and operation of the

---

Barbara Helling is Associate Professor of Sociology and Tutor in the Paracollege and Erling Jorstad is Professor of History at St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota. Both have served as Associates in the Teaching/Learning Center.

T/LC. In the Spring of 1977, as the Lilly grant was running out, the Faculty Development Committee (made a standing committee to replace the Task Force), was given the mandate to continue the faculty development program. It wrote a new proposal to be submitted to the Mellon Foundation. Its ingredients were based on a questionnaire checklist circulated among the faculty. Some 120 faculty responded with their ideas, indicating what should be included in such a proposal and the extent of their willingness to participate. The final proposal thus reflected the interests of a wide segment of the faculty.

In 1977 a grant from Mellon of $210,000 for a period of five years was received to implement the new proposal. While most of the new grant provides opportunities for individual research and study and departmental renewal the T/LC still was an important element in the total program. With the exception of the positions of two of the Associates who also serve as coordinators of special programs provided for in the Mellon grant, and a small sum from Mellon for a T/LC summer workshop, the College now supports the Teaching/Learning Center, out of regular budget funds indicating its continuing commitment to faculty development.

Since its establishment four years ago the Teaching/Learning Center has extended its influence on the campus while remaining basically unchanged in its structure. The Center is still directed by four Associates, though only one of these has continued from the beginning. A number of persons from a variety of departments including the Library and Educational Research have served for a year or more. This rotation has helped to increase the acceptance of the T/LC by different segments of the faculty as well as bringing a variety of interests and expertise to the planning and implementation of T/LC functions. In addition to the seminar-reading room lounge which makes accessible the latest and best reading material on improvement of teaching, student development, and a wide range of other topics related to teaching and higher education, an important feature of the program has been mealtime discussions. In 1975-76 twelve discussions were held with an average attendance of eight, not including the discussion leaders and Associates. In 1978-79 twenty were conducted at the T/LC with an average attendance of fifteen. Topics have included: team-teaching, personalized systems of instruction, teaching large lecture courses, values in the curriculum, the freshman year, experiential education, and Title IX.

The Center has also sponsored a number of workshops and seminars of various lengths, from a half day to a week, on the teaching of writing in the classroom, conducting discussions, advising students, course planning, evaluation and testing, time management, and other topics related to the profession of teaching. About once a month the T/LC publishes a newsletter, the *T/LC Courier*, which presents summaries of discussions, suggestions for reading, faculty interviews, and information from research on teaching, as well as program announcements.

Programs in the T/LC have occasionally been led by outside experts such as Kiyo Morimoto from the Harvard Bureau of Study Counsel and B. Claude Mathis from the Center for the Teaching Professions at Northwestern University. Most frequently, however, the leaders are interested St. Olaf faculty members and the Associates. Although some informational presentation is almost always included in a program, the intention is not so much to provide expert answers as it is to encourage faculty to consider teaching-related questions and rethink their own answers. Most often, the presentation serves to remind people of things they already knew but perhaps had not been utilizing. Although the Associates have been supported by the College in attendance at national and regional workshops and meetings to increase their knowledge and skills, they regard themselves as facilitators rather than experts. Those who attend T/LC programs find themselves sharing problems and solutions and learning from one another. Such sharing from the many departments has been of unusual help for the participants.

The T/LC from the beginning has recognized a danger to college teachers inherent in any program dedicated to improving teaching. Some faculty who sincerely want to strengthen some aspect of their teaching still believe they cannot afford to admit their need for improvement. Thus, a faculty development program such as the one at St. Olaf must provide a way of resolving this built-in conflict, allowing the teacher to expose his or her aspirations and needs with minimal risk. This has been achieved largely by making all participation in the T/LC or other faculty development activities voluntary. It is completely separated from formal administrative evaluations for retention, tenure, and promotion. However, a faculty member may choose to include in her or his dossier a description of that participation and its consequences as evidence of worthiness.

The experience at St. Olaf has also been able to reconcile another ongoing problem in faculty development. Writers on this subject often emphasize the need for administrative support and for "real" rewards for faculty members' efforts toward improvement. On the other hand, extensive involvement of administrators and the evaluation that necessarily attends decisions about giving those rewards tend to produce window dressing and defenses rather than serious engagement with teaching problems. The St. Olaf College administration has managed to walk a fine line between these alternatives, demonstrating commitment to the program and recognition for participation while avoiding threatening and potentially punishing uses.

Our experience has shown that a more direct link to evaluation by administration might increase attendance at the programs, but it would almost certainly diminish meaningful participation. The voluntary approach has placed the responsibility for participation in the program on the Associates to plan activities, and solicit others from their colleagues, which will be of interest to the faculty to meet their felt needs. This is at the heart of the work of the Associates.

Indeed, convincing evidence for the acceptance of the T/LC on campus has been the noticeable increase of faculty initiatives in program planning. While during the first year or so the Associates searched diligently to come up with topics which would attract faculty participation, today a significant number of programs and topics are coming from those persons wishing to see a particular subject explored and willing to assist in the leadership.

Beyond the fact that a large segment of the faculty have made the T/LC and its activities a part of their life on campus, the impact of participation is difficult to assess. Since the T/LC has eschewed a policy of telling people what is wrong with their teaching in favor of a philosophy that recognizes a variety of effective approaches to teaching, the fact that faculty members attending a particular session do take away new perspectives and ideas for classroom innovations is considered a positive outcome. The Center cannot and probably would not wish to say, however, that as a result of a workshop on classroom discussion, more teachers are using discussion in their classrooms. It is not easy to demonstrate, that as a result of that workshop some teachers are being more deliberate about their use of discussion; it is this philosophy, however, that is a more worthwhile objective.

Surely the variety of events that have occurred in the T/LC have resulted in a kind of communication that participants' comments indicate is desired but does not otherwise occur frequently on this campus. There are two elements to this communication. It occurs across disciplines and it focuses on the teaching of those disciplines. St. Olaf, like most institutions of higher education, is organized strongly along departmental lines. With a faculty of about 200, most know one another socially, but the structure does not encourage much professional exchange beyond the inevitable campus politics. Again, concern for the appearance of competency inhibits discussion of teaching problems, at least insofar as those problems are seen as being resolvable by teaching improvement. It is one thing to discuss particular problem students or types of students, academic structures, or time constraints which give us teaching problems. It is quite another to talk in any usual setting about now knowing what to try or not succeeding in attempts to teach as well as one can.

It has been reassuring and stimulating to faculty members to discover that good teachers in their own or other disciplines are struggling with similar problems. It is equally rewarding to learn that such colleagues will respond supportively and rewardingly to one's own ideas and can often suggest ideas adaptable to one's own particular teaching needs. Faculty members who have assumed that particular problems are unique to their discipline have been surprised to find new and helpful insights from others struggling in very different disciplines with the same basic problems under different guises. They also receive great personal encouragement from these exchanges.

In sum, the Teaching/Learning Center has sought to provide a legitimate place to express concerns about teaching and to help people draw on a wide

range of resources in order to do something constructive about those concerns. In the process of introducing this program, the Associates have found several ingredients to be of special help: to keep the agenda flexible enough to take up a problem as soon as it appears; to provide a good deal of low key, frequent publicity about the programs; to recognize administrative support; and to keep asking teachers to share what they have found constructive in their classes.

Talking About Teaching: the Contributions of Senior Faculty to Junior Faculty

G. MELVIN HIPPS

The practice of senior faculty members helping to initiate younger colleagues into the mysteries of college teaching as well as the politics of survival in a college community is certainly not a startling innovation in the faculty development movement. On the contrary, this type of mentoring has no doubt existed as long as there have been colleges and universities; and as a method of faculty development, it certainly pre-dates expense accounts for travel to the annual meeting of a professional society, workshops on teaching and learning modes, or even the traditional sabbatical leave.

So strong are the traditions of this professional *rite de passage* that many faculty members are loath to tamper with it; and since it exists partly as an underground resistance to the vagaries of administration, there is understandable suspicion of any attempt by administrators to formalize it within the organizational structure of the college. Nevertheless, that is precisely what Furman University attempted to do in a project entitled "The Scholar as Teacher: The Development of the New Faculty Member," a program supported by a grant from the Lilly Endowment, Inc., for the period June 1, 1978-May 31, 1981.

This project was the last in a series of faculty development programs sponsored at Furman by various foundations. A grant from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation had supported a project aimed at faculty development in academic planning (1975-1978). In 1977, the Andrew Mellon Foundation had given the University a grant for the personal and professional development of mid-career faculty members. Neither of these projects addressed many of the needs of the younger, inexperienced faculty members. The proposal to the Lilly Endowment grew out of the desire to assist in the development of these younger or newer faculty members, identified for the purposes of the project as those in

---

G. Melvin Hipps, formerly Professor of Education and Director of Faculty Development at Furman University, Greenville, South Carolina, is currently an independent consultant in Dallas, Texas.

their first five years as college teachers. The proposal was written by a faculty committee, discussed in an open forum of the faculty, revised on the basis of this discussion, and then submitted to the Endowment.

The purpose of the project was to assist new faculty members to become acclimated to the University and the teaching profession and to strengthen their skill as teachers. The assumptions underlying these broad goals were: 1) that most new faculty members had not had specific instruction or assistance in teaching; 2) that the most appropriate time to offer assistance in teaching is at the beginning of a faculty member's career; 3) that thorough knowledge of an academic discipline, while absolutely necessary, is not sufficient to assure success in teaching; 4) that many new faculty members try to teach undergraduates by the same methods by which they were taught in graduate school; 5) that most new faculty ordinarily know their disciplines thoroughly but have not analyzed the sequence or method by which they acquired their command of these disciplines; 6) that Furman would increase the likelihood of a positive adjustment to the teaching profession and the institution by a planned programn for this purpose.

The project had four main phases. The first was the equipping of a cadre of experienced faculty to serve as in-house consultants on teaching and learning. Five faculty members — one each in the fields of philosophy, music, chemistry, education, and health and physical education—we[illegible]osen by a committee of students, faculty, and administrators to prepare themselves for this role. These faculty members spent an entire summer and most of one term gaining the knowledge and skills necessary to fulfill their assignment. They chose their areas of study on the basis of their own interest in particular pedagogical issues and of the concerns they collected through a series of luncheon meetings with groups of new faculty members. One of them chose to concentrate on various approaches to lecturing and on the ways faculty and students perceive their roles; another studied techniques of questioning, leading discussions, and testing; another explored non-verbal communication and affective learning; the fourth one delved into learning theory; and the fifth one undertook a rather lengthy analysis of the application of the theories of Piaget to college teaching. In addition to their consultative tasks, these five faculty members served as the steering committee for the total project.

There were two main reasons for the decision to train faculty members as consultants on teaching and learning. The first was the assumption that faculty will respond more favorably to assistance given by their own faculty colleagues than to consultation by outside experts who know nothing about the institution, its students, and its mission. It was felt that newer faculty members at Furman would be positively disposed toward a discussion of learning theory if it were led by a respected colleague in music who had actually applied some of the theories in his own teaching or toward an analysis of the skills involved in lecturing if it were done by a philosophy professor widely recognized for his

reputation as an exciting lecturer. The second assumption was that schools like Furman (small, liberal arts colleges) were not likely to employ instructional development specialists to assist faculty in improving teaching and that from the faculty must come the motivation, the knowledge, and the skill to develop and implement an on-going program for improving teaching.

The second phase was closely related to the first. It consisted of a series of weekly workshops and seminars on teaching and learning led by the five faculty consultants. These were held during a "bag lunch" session at noon on Mondays and repeated at 3:00 p.m. on Wednesdays in order to try to involve as many faculty members as possible. The meetings were open to all faculty, not just to new ones. Generally the seminars and workshops dealt with topics the consultants had explored during the preparatory phase. However, the leaders frequently planned seminars and workshops on topics suggested by faculty members as the project progressed.

During the third phase there were opportunities for some experienced teachers and new teachers to work together in a mentor-novice relationship. Six such projects were supported during each of the last two years of the program. Each faculty member involved in this aspect of the Lilly program was released from one course in order to participate. Typically, the experienced and inexperienced faculty members would visit and critique each other's classes; disusss syllabi, assignments, tests, and papers; and explore ways the classes could be improved. Interdisciplinary teams were strongly encouraged. For example, a novice teacher in mathematics and an experienced one in history agreed to take each other's courses in order to be able to analyze them from the point of view of the learner. Some of the teams video-taped classes in order to critique them together. Although these were called "mentor-novice" projects, they were not viewed as relationships between superiors and inferiors. There was a clear recognition that the learning was to go both ways in these teams.

The final phase of the project was a mini-grant program in which individual faculty members could submit proposals for in-house grants to fund projects for the improvement of teaching. This was an open-ended program designed for the faculty member who had a particular idea about improving his teaching that could not be carried out under any other phase of the project. Four such grants were available during each of the last two years of the project. An example of a project supported under this phase was that of an instructor in the Department of Modern Foreign Languages who wanted to experiment with computer assisted instruction in languages.

Although these were the four major phases of the project, there were some additional activities. The five faculty members chosen as consultants on teaching and learning were also informally constituted as an institutional committee on the improvement of teaching. In this capacity they were available to interview prospective faculty members and to assist in the orientation of new faculty. Underlying these activities were the assumptions that faculty develop-

ment should begin during the interview phase of their careers and that contact with a committee on the improvement of teaching would impress upon prospective faculty the importance the institution places upon the quality of teaching. Another function served by this process was orienting prospective and new faculty to other aspects of the character and values of the institution, including its mission as a Christian college. It was felt that new teachers' acclimation to Furman and thus to the teaching profession would be enhanced if they understood as early as possible and as thoroughly as possible the kind of school Furman is and the personal and professional expectations the institution has for them. Another function of the steering committee was to be on call to give assistance to other faculty on matters pertaining to teaching, such as course planning, teaching methods, and test construction.

The impact of the Lilly project on the college generally and the faculty particularly has been quite significant. By far, the single most important change is that instructional development has been accepted as a legitimate goal of faculty development on a par with the more traditional professional development activities — the research grant, the sabbatical, and expense-paid trips to professional meetings. For the first time, faculty members held formal and broadly based discussion on such topics as testing and leading discussions. Formerly, such discussions were relegated to brief exchanges in the coffee room. One can speculate on why such discussions are so late in arriving on the scene at a college like Furman. The answer probably lies somewhere between the feeling that such discussions are unnecessary and the fear of revealing one's ignorance and shortcomings to colleagues. If this perception has any validity, there is evidence that these feelings and fears are subsiding. One young teacher who was particularly struck by the insights she gained during a workshop on testing requested that the group assist her by critiquing a test she had actually given to one of her classes.

Other evidence of the acceptance of instructional development was that approximately sixty per cent of the new faculty eligible to submit proposals for the mentor-novice and the mini-grant projects did so. Furthermore, there was an average attendance of twenty-five (out of a faculty of 145) at the weekly workshops and seminars on teaching. Admittedly, the number of participants says nothing about the quality or the results of a program, but since no was forced, either openly or subtly, by any superior to participate, one could assume faculty did so because of their perception of the value of the programs to them.

Instructional development appears to have been accepted equally well by experienced faculty as by the new ones. Although the workshops and seminars on teaching were designed for those in their first five years of teaching, over half the participants in every session were faculty members with more than five years experience, a phenomenon unanticipated by the steering committee. The explanation for this development may be that since the programs were not designed for experienced faculty members and since, therefore, there was no

implication that these faculty "needed" these sessions, they felt neither intimidated nor coerced. Whatever the explanation for their participation, it was invaluable to the success of the programs.

The creation of a structure within which faculty members in different departments could discuss teaching and participate in mutually beneficial activities related to teaching was another important result of the Lilly project. Formerly, what discussions there were about teaching ordinarily took place within departments and concerned such questions as "How do you explain osmosis?" or "What do you ask your students on a test on the federal regulatory agencies?" or "What do you think is the optimum number of themes to require in freshman English?" The interdisciplinary mentor-novice projects allowed faculty to analyze, with the help of a sympathetic colleague in another discipline, their assumptions about teaching methods, about the ways students learn, about the structure and sequence of content in their disciplines, and about the relevance of various concepts in their fields to the present and future lives of students. Furthermore, the five members of the steering committee speak in glowing terms of their own professional and personal development occasioned by their opportunities to work with faculty members in disciplines other than their own.

Throughout the planning and implementation of this project the administrators and faculty came to several conclusions concerning the process for introducing such projects into a college community. First, to be successful, any faculty development program must be designed and overseen by the faculty or by members of the faculty perceived by them to represent their interests. Any administrative position in these projects should be filled by a respective and trusted faculty member. The development of the proposal by a faculty committee and the opportunity for all faculty to comment on it in an open forum seemed to be the most appropriate method for initiating the program at Furman.

Second, an instructional development program must be supported by all levels of administration from the departmental chairperson on up. If external funding is obtained for program initiation, there must be a specific commitment from the administration that the program will be supported when the external funding is exhausted. If such a commitment is not made or is made insincerely, then faculty may perceive that the project is not worth their time and energy. Furthermore, if faculty do participate and are benefitted by the program, there will be a serious morale problem if the program is discontinued.

Also, administrators can aid the success of a project like the one at Furman by reducing the faculty's perceived "risks" of participating in the program. Younger faculty understandably spend their time on those activities they perceive will be most readily recognized in the institutional reward system; therefore, administrators must make it clear that participation in a program of instructional development is valued by the institution. Such assurance must be demonstrated with deeds as well as words. Furthermore, faculty members who

may be in departments whose leadership is less than enthusiastic about teaching improvement programs must have some assurance that they will at least not be penalized for participating. Third, it is imperative for the leadership of such a project continually to seek advice and guidance from the target group. In a project designed for new faculty members, it is all to easy to do what experienced faculty do in their teaching, that is, to plan what they think is best for the student without ever consulting the student about his needs and wishes.

Fourth, students should be appropriately involved in the program. Insufficient student involvement was perhaps the greatest weakness of Furman's project. Students did help select the five members of the steering committee, and there was one seminar that included students; but there could have been more widespread and imaginative involvement of students in dialogues with faculty. If one assumption of a teaching improvement project is that the teacher must continually view his subject from the point of view of the learner, there there must be activities to allow faculty to discern that point of view.

Fifth, if a school adopts a model of faculty development that employs faculty members as consultants, provision must be made for the time when the consultants will wish to go back to full-time teaching and new consultants will have to be prepared. This periodic change in consultants is advantageous because it sets the stage for development and renewal of a large number of faculty members.

Sixth, and finally, the participants in the Lilly project have concluded that the most productive discussions of teaching (as opposed to teaching a particular subject) do not necessarily occur within a department and that occasions for interdisciplinary discussions must be specifically structured. However fervently some faculty may wish to preserve the tradition of casual, unstructured relationships between older and younger faculty members, it seems clear that some younger faculty with the most pressing needs will often not directly seek the help of an experienced colleague, especially one in another department. Likewise, many older faculty who have a great many insights to offer may be reluctant to meddle or to appear immodest in an attempt to assist their younger co-workers, especially those in other disciplines.

In sum, younger and older faculty have much to offer each other, but a structured program may be necessary to bring them together for mutual benefit.

An Institute on Teaching and Learning for New Faculty

JOHN F. NOONAN

Each January since 1975, I have conducted an institute on college teaching for faculty who are new to one of the member institutions of the Central Pennsylvania Consortium — Dickinson, Franklin and Marshall, Gettysburg, Wilson. The original idea for this mid-year retreat was Dr. Arden K. Smith's, then the Executive Director of the consortium. He invited me to meet with the four deans in fall 1974 where, with Dr. Smith's assistance, I outlined a plan for the first institute, which they endorsed.

The plan has remained basically unchanged over the years: the institute begins with an informal gathering late Thursday afternoon, and closes with lunch Sunday. It has always been held in a rustic setting away from the four campuses, in January between semesters, and is attended by 10 to 15 faculty, most of whom are in their first year of full-time teaching.

Six weeks or so before the conference, I and an associate who will help me conduct the meeting, visit the campuses for hour-long interviews with faculty who have signed up. During these meetings, the faculty are invited to explore their teaching assumptions, strengths, and concerns. We use these conversations to guide our preparation for the institute. Not unimportantly, we have been told many times, these December interviews also give the faculty a chance to meet us and to ask us questions about the conference. We have been told that these conversations dispel some of the anxiety faculty bring to retreats of this kind.

Participants have usually been asked to complete a homework assignment before coming. In recent years, we've asked them to write a short case description of a particular event from their teaching and to bring enough copies for everyone else to read. Like everything else during the weekend, the cases are used as texts for exploring the assumptions about learning and teaching that undergird the participants' pedagogies.

While it is certainly true that the institutes are intended to help faculty with their teaching — by addressing topics like "Enhancing Lectures," "Making

John F. Noonan is Director of the Center for Improving Teaching Effectiveness, and Associate Professor of English, at Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia.

Discussions More Lively," "Planning Courses More Imaginatively," "Making Useful Critical Comments on Student Work" — they are also intended to challenge the way the faculty *think about* their teaching.

Directions For Writing A Teaching Case

Diane Arbus, the late photographer, used to say that "the more specific something is the more general it is." I have come to believe that about my work with faculty. Studying the teaching of one person, even a single event in that person's teaching, is a way to learn about our own teaching. The case you write will give others a chance to think about their own teaching as they think about yours.

Think of a specific moment from your own teaching, one you are willing to share with others. It might be a class meeting where you wanted to accomplish a particular goal; or a conference you had with a perplexing student; or a grading disagreement; or a class discussion.

Write a paragraph or two that will help the reader understand the moment. For example, if the case deals with a student whose work is unsatisfactory, write a few sentences that tell the reader the evidence your conviction is based on — test scores, behavior in class, a project — and a few more that describe the student him/herself. In other words, write up whatever background information a reader will need to understand your case.

Now write a page that portrays the event, paying particular attention to your role: what were you hoping to accomplish? What did you do? What did the student do or say? Be sure you reconstruct as much of the dialogue as you can, including your own words.

Now write a page or so about the effects of the moment — on you and on others. What did you learn about learning? about teaching ? What did you learn about yourself? What else stands out to you?

Besides addressing these cases and the concerns heard in the December interviews, the institutes have always featured practica: occasions for faculty to teach something to colleagues and then solicit critiques of that teaching. We've usually videotaped these sessions so faculty can see how they look. The pressures of time require that each practicum be limited to about 15 minutes. The subsequent critiques take another 45 minutes. An hour is not a long time to spend on an individual's teaching — in many cases we only scratch the surface — but the nearly unanimous response to the practica is: "These were the most valuable features of the conference."

The practica treat learning as well as teaching. Faculty are encouraged to discuss the impacts the teaching has on them. This kind of talk leads quickly to an important point: teachers have different effects on different students. Becoming sensitive to those varied effects, faculty learn each January, is an important step toward becomming a more resourceful teacher.

A typical agenda for an institute looks like this:

Thursday

4:30 p.m.	Introductions/wine/cheese
6:00 p.m.	Dinner
7:00-9:00 p.m.	Fireside discussion of assumptions about learning and teaching, featuring recordings of classes and written cases.

Friday

8:00 a.m.	Breakfast
9:00 a.m.	Practica
12:00 noon	Lunch
1:30 p.m.	Planning courses
4:30 p.m.	Wine and soft drinks
6:00 p.m.	Dinner
7:00-9:00 p.m.	Fireside discussion of assumptions about learning and teaching, featuring written cases

Saturday

8:00 a.m.	Breakfast
9:00 a.m.	Conducting discussions and seminars
11:00 a.m.	Enhancing Lectures
12:00 noon	Lunch
1:30 p.m.	Practica
4:30 p.m.	Wine and cheese
6:00 p.m.	Dinner
7:00-9:00 p.m.	Fireside discussion of topics that have emerged in the conference

Sunday

7:30 a.m.	Breakfast
8:30 a.m.	Review of individual plans for follow up Review and critique of the institute
11:30 a.m.	Lunch
12:00 noon	Adjourn

What have the institute's impacts been? There are two main sources of information here. One is a written critique made by participants during the Sunday morning session. The other is the notes I made in April 1978 when I interviewed seventeen alums from the 1975, 1976, and 1977 conferences, in a fairly systematic fashion.

Here are several comments made on the institute's last morning:

— For me the strongest quality of the institute was its low key, supportive atmosphere. Had it been the opposite, I would have been torn between trying to listen and think about the ideas being suggested for discussion and my own anxieties about being forced to participate and being subjected to a competitive situation. The absence of a rigid structure was a second strong point. Having sat in a grade school classroom for five years straight, I have a knee-jerk reaction against being forced to be in a given place at a given time, and to being a passive sponge. In this connection, the give and take discussions made me feel that the two "teachers" in charge did not hold an absolute truth, that they too could learn from us, that their role was to give us the benefit of their accumulated experience and reflection. In summation, it was the psychological ambience which facilitated, stimulated and catalyzed learning. In turn, I feel I have a concrete model to adapt for some of my courses.

— The strong point seemed to me to lie in the rare opportunity to see our colleagues teach and, simultaneously, to see ourselves teaching. The essential condition that made this possible and profitable was a "non-threatening," non-judgmental, supportive atmosphere. The practica hours were the place where this was going on most intensively.

— The institute encouraged us each to think of our strategies and values in teaching, bringing our own experiences and questions into a "public" discussion, to a degree that most of us have not in the past. We not only brought into discussions our intellectual "baggage" but also thought of new things as we went. I think we came away with not only specific helpful ideas, but a willingness to try new things, a knowledge that we are not alone in our problems, and some good feelings about our own contribution to others' ideas about teaching.

— The institute is a place for valuable group interaction, but it's also a place for solitary wondering and reflection. For me the strongest thing about the institute was the flexibility for both these ends provided by the setting and the make-up of the people in the group.

— Perhaps the most remarkable effect of this institute is the total opportunity which has been given to me to learn about teaching. I came with the assumptions, admittedly vague, that this kind of learning would probably take place only in very specific areas — particularly those involving strategy. But, instead, the atmosphere which developed — open, supportive, but also provocative — encouraged me to expand into other aspects of my teaching and my personality. What the results of such total involvement will be is difficult to estimate at this point. A period of reflection is needed for things to coalesce. I hope it will be a chain of reflections which will result in experimentation and perhaps the formation of something new and better, something which might not have

happened as readily without the context of this institute.

— I don't get much out of "contextless" discussions of teaching, e.g. a discussion of the merits of defining objectives is not helpful to me, outside the context of a course, or class, in a specific field.

— Although I felt that the large, unstructured discussions were useful and intellectually stimulating, I find large discussions a bit intimidating and would feel freer to contribute in a smaller group with perhaps a more structured topic.

— It seems very important to me that the institute emphasize from the beginning that people *should* go off by themselves while here, to cut down some of the intensity and to begin assimilating material which can later be more helpful because it has been so personally internalized. That the necessity for solitary rather than programmed learning was not emphasized enough seems to me in some small way a weakness of the institute — but not enough of a weakness to have prevented me from doing what I wanted or needed to do.

— As to criticisms, perhaps I reflect a flaw in my own personality that after a certain amount of positive reinforcement, I start to feel suspicious of the sincerity behind it and am inclined to say, "Well, he's saying that because he thinks it's good for me to hear it." While I relished the strokes I got in my teaching analysis, I particularly valued the observations which confirmed my own suspicions about weak points in my presentation. I feel that it is really fortunate that I was here to contrast my perceptions with those of faculty in the social sciences and humanities. It is unfortunate that you do not have some control over the "mix" of the backgrounds which make up the institute; at least to the extent of insuring balance among views. On the other hand, if there had been another physical scientist here, we would probably have spent time discussing nitty-gritty issues peculiar to us; this would in fact have detracted from my experience (I believe), as I would have focused less on the universal character of the educational process.

— Although it was a stimulating event, the intensity became oppressive after a certain period of time. One of two things must be done: either shorten the length of the institute or hold it in a location with recreational facilities. At times the ways in which the leaders of the institute arranged and directed discussions was too concerned with setting agendas and dealing with topics in some categorical manner. This caused a few issues to die on the vine since they were delayed and when reintroduced there was no longer the original enthusiasm.

1978 Interviews

I learned years ago to resist making generalizations about faculty. Though I've listened to scores of professors talk in detail about their teaching and about

other parts of their professional lives, I am still struck by the differences. My seventeen interviews in 1978 with institute alums did not alter my convictions that the lives of college faculty are not honored by bracketing them into stages and typologies. There is no substitute for listening attentively to one story at a time, hearing the deep tones that comprise an individual's experience. Too many people who write about faculty treat them as though they were stick figures in a melodrama.

The Central Pennsylvania Consortium's winter institutes begin with the presupposition that no two teachers are the same, even those in the same discipline, and in the same department. The interviews beforehand, the case descriptions, the teaching practica, the discussions that go on into the night — all these events try to acknowledge the uniqueness of each person's vision as a teacher. If those individuating properties are apparent during the institutes, they were overwhelming that spring when I interviewed the alums. For instance, I asked each one "what stands out so far in your teaching career?" Here are their comments:

— I'm glad I moved from full-time scientific research to teaching.
— I realized I'm not suited to teaching.
— I'm learning to feel more relaxed.
— I'm beginning to develop my own criteria for my work.
— I'm evolving a style of teaching that suits me.
— I've learned to value the goals of liberal education.
— Students here are so vastly different from the college I went to.
— I feel very isolated.
— I'm confused about my performance and don't know what to do about it.
— My weariness.
— I like this profession.
— How vulnerable my courage makes me.
— The sheer exhileration of teaching.
— I get absolutely no feedback, no reinforcement.
— My willingness not to confront people who can jeopardize my tenure decision.
— My loneliness.
— Becoming a more caring person with students.

I also asked them to comment on the institute. Here are the comments I heard:

— It helped me to make a transition from thinking of teaching as mainly a way to transmit a body of knowledge, to regarding it as a way of reasoning.
— A pleasant time, a few useful ideas, like using student observers in my classes. It was nice.
— Was valuable to meet other faculty and explore their ideas about teaching. I'd have appreciated more structure, though, and fewer choices among activities.

— It gave me a chance to look at myself as THE professor, and began my thinking about how inauthentic that was for me. I've moved on now to being more centered on my students.
— I helped me clarify my teaching goals, and to develop processes of instructional evaluation that fit them.
— It was interesting, but not as influential as my experiences with students have been. I liked spending a weekend talking about teaching.
— It was a neat experience, but then I'm into neat experiences. I made some friends, and got ideas there for critiquing students.
— It was my first exposure to the elements of teaching, and made me more thoughtful about my own.
— It provided colleagueship for me which is in short supply in higher education lately.
— It gave me a lot of encouragement to move in more evocative, less didactic, directions in my teaching.
— It confirmed my suspicion that didactic teaching suits me and my students just fine.
— It gave me courage to try out different things as a teacher, to find ways that suit me, not an abstract model.
— It really made me examine my assumption that challening students is more important than confirming them. Now I realize both are important, though the former comes more naturally to me than the latter.

What clues about the transition from graduate school to teaching can be discerned in the experiences of these faculty? I would like to offer several possibilities:

1. We should not underestimate the difficulty some young faculty have in forming collegial associations on their campus. Not unimportantly, we should not overestimate the difficulties older faculty have either. I have been told many times by senior faculty that they would like to become friends with their junior colleagues, but the transitory existence of junior people in the 1970's — "you know they cannot all be tenured, even the best among them. Moreover many of them are on fixed-term appointments. You get to know them and they are gone," as someone put it not long ago — makes doing this difficult.

But even the junior people themselves do not automatically become friends. One alum told me: "Until we came here, we didn't even know each other; and we're on the same faculty. Now I've at least got some people to discuss my work with."

Why is this important? Among other reasons, having no peers to talk to about teaching means a person is missing an important context for learning on the job. Experience may be a good teacher, but sharing that experience with a colleague who is willing to help make sense of it is a better teacher.

2. Among the unexamined presuppositions about teaching carried by some new faculty to these conferences and challlenged there are:

Teachers are responsible for their students' learning.
To criticize means to say negative things about a student's work, and negative things are more valuable than positive things.
It is the student's vulnerability we must be sensitive to, not our own, because teachers are stronger than students.
We have to teach students how to think.
Silence is the enemy of discussion.
Teachers must learn to keep discussions on track.
Lectures make students passive.
Not being nervous before class is better than being nervous.
You can make some valid generalizations about students and ways to teach them.

Perhaps new faculty elsewhere have the same unexamined assumptions about their work. If so, then this list may make a good starting place for discussions with them.

3. Development of one's teaching is enhanced by opportunities to hear people discuss the impacts one has on them. Exact descriptions of those impacts are more valuable to a young teacher than general statements about his or her effectiveness.

4. Listening to people talk about their teaching is fun.

Common Language: A Faculty Response to Developing Specific Skills

JAMES D. PICKERING

Page twenty-nine of the Gettysburg College Catalogue for 1979/80 begins with the headline "Requirements for the Degree of Bachelor of Arts." After the general listing of the categories of requirement — number of courses, minimum average, and the like — the following bold-face subhead appears: "Writing Policy"; under that subhead occurs the following statement:

> *Since the ability to express oneself clearly, correctly and responsibly is essential for an educated person, the College cannot graduate a student whose writing abilities are deficient. See Item 1 under Distribution Requirements below. Grades on poorly written papers, regardless of the course, may be reduced because of the quality of writing; in extreme cases, a failing grade may be given for this reason.*

Following this admonition to "See Item 1 under Distribution Requirements below," the student finds (still on p. 29) this prescription:

> *1) Demonstration of proficiency in written English. Such proficiency is demonstrated by passing English 101. A student may be exempted from the requirement on the basis of scores of the Test of Standard Written English or a writing examination given on campus early in the fall term.*

These requirements are the result of a policy decision taken by the whole faculty of Gettysburg College in the spring term of 1977. The decision was not a sudden one, and the discussion which led up to it was not, I am sure, unique to the Gettysburg College faculty. Some form of mild controversy over who is "responsible" for the teaching of the skills of expository and argumentative writing simmers and smolders through most faculties in one form or another. I won't say that ours burst into flame in March-April, 1977. Rather I will say that a couple of colleagues in the English Department had, first, the courage of their convictions and, second, the imagination and initiative to shape those convictions into a proposal for action. The proposal included putting the faculty on record as being committed to competence in writing as necessary to graduation, but more importantly, it included three specific programs for the implementa-

---

James D. Pickering is Professor of English at Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

85

tion of the policy. These measures also gave form and force to the faculty's commitment to the teaching of writing skills.

The first of these programs was the design and administration, by the English Department, of a writing sample to be taken by each entering student early in the first term; according to each student's performance on this writing sample, he or she would be enrolled in or exempted from English 101. The second program was the organization and staffing, by the English Department, of a Writing Center to which any faculty member might refer a student whose writing showed greater deficiency than the referring instructor had time and expertise to remedy. As this Center became established, students could use it as a kind of clinic in the process of preparation or as a kind of post-mortem clinic for papers already submitted and evaluated.

The third program — the one upon which we'll focus our attention in this discussion — was a series of writing "seminars," designed and staffed by members of the English Department and presented to some twenty faculty colleagues at a time. Each series, presented for 2½ to 3 hours on the first four Saturday mornings of each fall and spring term, consisted of four discussion-demonstration sessions focusing on the kinds of difficulty which students seem chronically to have; suggesting and outlining methods for clearing up these difficulties; and offering opportunities to work, in small discussion groups, with samples of student writing selected to demonstrate both the difficulties and the qualities of student writing.*

Because of funds provided to the College by a foundation and administered by the College, we were able to bring in resource persons for the planning of these "seminar" sequences and for the kind of follow-up session which concluded each academic year; and we were able to offer stipends both to the English Department members involved in instructing the sessions and to the faculty members who enrolled as participants. Beginning in the fall of 1977, we conducted four seminar sequences, the last of which was completed in March, 1979. In April, 1978 and in May, 1979, we held follow-up sessions for the forty persons who had participated in the two sequences for the academic year.

To Drs. Mary Margaret Stewart and Pamela Di Pesa, Professor and Assistant Professor of English, respectively, goes full credit for the proposal as outlined above and for the specific steps involved both in enunciating the College policy and in implementing the faculty's commitment to making the policy work. These two were also heavily involved in our preparation of the seminar sequences and in conducting the sessions. Dean Emerita Virginia Elliot, for years director of programs for the instruction of composition at the University of Pittsburgh, gave us guidance — indeed, she presented us with a compact and invaluable seminar of our own — in designing our sequences.

---

* These samples were always presented anonymously so that neither the student who had written the paper nor the instructor who had corrected and evaluated it would be known.

While the sessions continued to design themselves, so to speak, as they were being conducted, we were able to begin with a fairly well-designed pattern. That pattern was organized to correspond with what might be the order in which the instructor perceives the student's essay, examination question, laboratory report, or research paper. The first session focused on grammar, syntax, diction, and usage. By means of work sheets of samples of student errors, culled from student writing in all disciplines, the instructor of the first session took the group through the recognition of common errors in grammar, syntax, and diction and into a discussion of the kinds of remedy effective for these errors and of the techniques of editing which would enable the student to proofread and revise his or her work to eliminate these nagging problems.

The second session in the sequence, again working with selections of samples, moved to what might be regarded as the second level of perception: the structure of sentences and the combinations of sentences into paragraphs. Again, the session depended heavily on discussion of the samples and on the process of editing and revising as the means to the goal of effective variation in sentence structure and to clear organization and focusing of paragraphs.

Session three emphasized the organization of the essay as a whole. The samples used in this session were complete essay answers to examination questions, complete shorter papers (about five pages long), and complete laboratory reports. The seminar participants sought, first of all, the indicators of organization: introduction, clearly stated thesis, suggestions for the method and direction of investigation and discussion, conclusions, and the kinds of skill in, or problem with, guiding the reader through an expository or argumentative essay.

I will interrupt the sequence here to point out two useful measures which we found by means of a kind of serendipity. The first measure was the use, for reference, of a good handbook for English composition,* with a correction chart to which we could refer for a kind of common vocabulary. The second measure was to get into the participants' hands, before each session, both this text and the sample materials to be used in the session. Our funding enabled us to get the *Handbook* to the participants before each sequence began. At the same time, we circulated a general assignment sheet to all; then, at least a week before each session, we issued a discussion outline and specific assignment sheet with the sample materials to be used. Perhaps the best indication that these measures worked is that no one came into the sessions without both a sense of what he or she would discuss and a vocabulary with which to join the discussion.

The fourth session, the last in the sequence, underwent the greatest revision as we went along. At first, it was designed to draw on the previous three as a

*Perrin and Corder's *Handbook of Current English*, 5th edition. Scott Foresman, 1978.

means of suggesting a workable process of evaluation. Diction, grammar, syntax, sentence and paragraph design, and overall organization were to be drawn together and balanced in a kind of scale of priority on the assignment of a grade to the finished paper and in the design of the comments to accompany that evaluation. This session also became a catchall for such important miscellany as the methods of proper and sufficient documentation, style, and — important at Gettysburg College — the application of the Academic Honor Code.

What became apparent as we moved from term to term was that the fourth session should become in two senses a kind of practical summary of the first three sessions. "Practical summary" came to mean essentially two things: first, and perhaps most important, it broke the large group of twenty into small groups of five for the more detailed clinical examination and discussion of student work; second; it became the means of emphasizing student inexperience in writing as perhaps the main trouble of which most student errors are symptomatic. By the time we arrived at the closing session of the fourth term's sequence, we were able to get discussions effectively into the relation between the specifics of editing and the more general holistic processes of evaluation. We also found ourselves quite profitably engaged in discussion of the relationship between the substance and statement of the assignment to the student's performance on the essay.

Indeed, as the sessions progressed through each sequence, we found ourselves increasingly discussing the means of tailoring the writing assignments to the teaching of the subject and methods of the course. Most gratifying and useful was the gradual discovery that the teaching of the skills of writing was not only not incompatible with the teaching of the "subject matter" of the course but was, indeed, a means to that end as well as to the end of sharpening composition skills.

The pattern which emerged from these four-session sequences and from the follow-up sessions conducted at the end of each academic year was that the teaching of writing skills integrated rather neatly with the teaching of just about any course of any kind. The use of short writing assignments such as précis writing and summary analysis both got the student into the materials of the course directly and assisted in his or her preparation for that longer paper which so frequently looms fearfully over the term's work.

If the account of these four faculty seminar sequences sound like fond reminiscence, to some extent it is just that. Reinforcing the sense that the experience was enjoyable are the responses to evaluation questionnaires distributed later in each term in which the seminars were presented. These questionnaires were designed to assist the program presenters in planning the sequences still to be offered. Such changes as increasing use of and emphasis on working directly with samples of student writing were suggested by the responses to the questionnaire. Even the continuation of the program beyond the first two terms was encouraged by these responses. The responses were, I suspect, also

influential in securing financial support for the second year's cycle in 1978-79.

Still, the tasks of measuring the impact of the program on the faculty as a whole — even on the eighty faculty members who participated — is difficult to describe objectively. Better than 90% attendance at the follow-up meetings might be cited, but this statistic may also reflect simply the residue of pleasure in the association among the instructors and their participating colleagues. But that pleasure, described by one colleague as being involved with faculty outside of one's department in serious discussion and exchange of experience and ideas about important techniques of teaching, may be an important impact of the seminar program. Another faculty-wide opportunity, this time for work with the hard- and software of the College Computer Center, may very well be modelled, both in intention and in method, on the opportunity for such learning amid the exchange of experience and ideas. Until we devise means for assessing the effect of the seminars on the teaching patterns and processes of those eighty people to their colleagues who were not involved, we will have to be content with our strong, yet vague, sense that the occasion was both pleasant and profitable.

The difficulties of assessing impact on individual faculty and on the collective pedagogy of the whole faculty is far surpassed by the difficulty of evaluting the changes in the students' ability to write. Not until the spring of 1980, for example, will we graduate a class which has had the benefit of (or at least been subjected to) the entire program. The first writing sample was administed in the fall of 1976; the faculty adoped the policy of including proficiency in English composition as a graduation requirement effective as of the fall of 1977; and the faculty seminars began in the same September. The Writing Center was initiated in the spring of 1978, and began to operate in its present form in September of that year. Finally, in the spring term of 1979, the faculty agreed to implement a College-wide student writing competition. From the interest of a fund provided by an interested alumnus, three substantial monetary prizes are awarded to each of the students judged to have submitted the best essays by a panel of judges from each of three groups of academic departments. All of these emphases on the importance of composition and on the teaching of composition are intended to improve the quality of student writing. However, the means for discerning and measuring that improvement and, more importantly, of relating it to the elements of the program have yet to be devised.

But there seems to be one thing that we have been able to judge. The need for such programs as Drs. Stewart and Di Pesa designed, especially for the faculty seminar sequences, is, I would suggest, always with us. Perceiving that need requires no extraordinary powers of perception. Getting a program to meet that need before a faculty and into operation is entirely another matter.

To begin with, such a program must be demonstrably directed at improving a situation or solving a problem widely shared by a faculty, if not universally shared. Second, the initiation of this kind of effort must come out of fairly

inclusive faculty and administration discussion. Third, this kind of program of faculty development must have financial support. That we were able to offer stipends to both instructors and participants, that we could compensate resource persons of both reputation and competence, and that we could afford the amenities of dining to accompany our follow-up meetings as well as such mundane but useful tools and materials as a text and various kinds of home printed materials, as well as stenographic help, made possible and eased the task of putting a program into shape and into operation.

The proposers of the program, for example, were able to read the uneasiness which always accompanies the discussion of students' inabilities to write or of their inexperience with composition and to translate that uneasiness into a clearly stated and logically related sequence of steps from policy to practicality. Put another way, the proposers of the program set it neatly into a context of concern in the institution.

But of equal value in their accomplishment was their patience. Initiating such a program as this Program for the Improvement of Writing at Gettysburg College, of which the Faculty Writing seminars were a part, required discussion and decision by the Department of English, the faculty Committee on Academic Policy and Program, the faculty as a whole, and finally, the faculty committee which administered the Faculty Development Fund. All of these processes completed, the next demands on the proposers' patience came with the practicalities of staffing the seminars, planning the pattern of instruction, and sifting the suggestions which sometimes clutter both of these processes. Add to these demands the necessity of maintaining momentum through the summer months and completing preparations for the first sequence to begin in the first week of the fall term, and one must conclude that patience was reinforced by persistence.

The proposers were also reinforced by strong support from two necessary sources. First, their proposal immediately caught the rather enthusiastic attention of the English Department. The speed and strength of the departmental response gave impetus to the channeling of the proposals to the faculty Committee on Academic Policy and Program where departmental endorsement both influenced and accelerated committee approval. The English Department moved quickly and strongly to analyze the faculty seminar stage of the proposed program; to make decisions on staffing, enrollment, and calendar; and to apply for funding to the faculty committee charged with dispensing foundation grant funds for faculty development. By the time the larger three-stage program came before the whole faculty, this strong departmental support and quick action had begun to engender equal enthusiasm, especially among some influential faculty outside the English Department.

Parallel to this welcome line of development is the part played in this progress by Dr. Leonard I. Holder, the Dean of the Faculty. He saw quickly the integration among the program's three parts and understood the need to keep it

moving toward adoption and implementation. An *ex officio* member of both key faculty committees, Dean Holder kept his own, and others', attention properly directed. The tenacity and diplomacy which no Dean should be without added to the combination of quantities and qualities, initiatives and supporting efforts which made the program work.

As we look back on the program as it has progressed, we conclude that the success which we have had thus far had its foundation in the discovery of a sense, in the institution as a whole, that conversation had gone far enough. From that discovery came the understanding that any kind of program of action had to be the result of the commitment of the whole faculty and administration to that program: hence the early adoption of the policy outlines in our opening paragraphs. As policy led to specific program design, we were much encouraged by the knowledge that funds were available to support it.

But two things must be said in conclusion. First, we were very lucky that enrollment in our first seminar sequence included five department chairpersons and several faculty whose reputations both as scholars and as teachers of writing outside of the English Department made clear that these seminars were not going to be simply remedial measures or preparation for new instructors. The word which they spread and the example which they set left us with a waiting list of applicants for each subsequent sequence.

The second concluding note is our own estimate of some of the results which we have observed. The long accepted idea that one simply asked students (at least those not in English Composition courses) to write without giving them a specific idea of *what* to write and some instruction in *how* to write passed quickly as consciousness of the problem was shared. In this process, those in the seminars managed to generate an atmosphere in which faculty members could ask questions without embarassment. That kind of trust led further into the sharing of experience and experiments in designing and presenting writing assignments over the whole range of undergraduate courses: across the spectrum of departmental disciplines and along the scale of student experience, from introductory, through intermediate, to advanced course work.

Perhaps the best kind of indication is an illustration. Discussion of a sample paper from the Mathematics Department began with an uneasy sense that, despite some flaws in its presentation, the essay seemed competent. Then a physicist and an economist sophisticated in statistics pointed out problems, and others found gaps in the first impression of the writing itself. Before the discussion had ended, the paper had been analyzed in general and in detail, confidence in the group's critical competence had grown, and individual participants found themselves agreeing that form and content can't really be clearly or finally separated. Such an experience is not an objective measure of success, but it is a source of satisfaction.

Preparing Faculty for Teaching Core Curriculum Courses

D. MICHAEL RIVAGE-SEUL

Every June for the last five academic years, the focus of roughly one third of the Berea College teaching staff rapidly shifts from the recently completed examinations and commencement exercises to the business of faculty development workshops, rather than to sunny beaches and resort vacations. These workshops comprise the heart of Berea's core curriculum faculty development program. And a brief examination of them, along with the program's other components, will show the entire project is rather distinctive in nature, when compared with other similar arrangements connected with core curricula.

To begin with, the core development program at Berea receives its distinguishing characteristics from the nature of Berea College itself — an institution with a clearly defined set of goals which shape its instructional program in general and its core component in particular. Secondly, the core curriculum itself is comprised not of simple "distribution requirements" united perhaps by a common theme and taught by instructors working within their own disciplines (though the college does have such requirements). Rather, it is made up of a set of four distinct courses, each of an interdisciplinary nature, and taught by faculty supplied by most of the departments in the college.

Because of this radically interdisciplinary nature, Berea's development program takes on a bifocal character with heavy content emphasis. That is, the project is primarily collective in scope — geared towards the education of the teams which staff the courses in question, rather than towards preparing individual instructors. At the same time, however, provision is made for the usual sabbatical and released time enrichment at the individual level. In addition, the cross-disciplinary character of the curriculum moves the faculty participants towards acquiring information, rather than non-specific teaching skills. The hopeful theory behind all of this is that as teachers collectively mature in their familiarity with the core material, they will feed on one another's progress, and that this interaction will be reflected in the evolution of the program itself. Thus

---

D. Michael Rivage-Seul is Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Religion and Director of the Issues and Values Program at Berea College, Berea, Kentucky.

72

in the end, both faculty development and core curricular development will have been meshed.

What follows, then, is a brief description of Berea College itself and of its core program. To this will be added an account of the origin of the faculty development project, as well as a description of the form it has taken. Next will come a word assessing the development project's impact on the college and its faculty. Finally, there will be some observations concerning our "learnings" over the years about what works in the process of introducing and implementing such a program. The anticipation would be that other interested parties might learn from Berea's modest successes and from its sometimes not-so-modest failures. It is also hoped that the sharing of these ideas might stimulate a feedback flow of information enabling us to further refine our own program in the light of the successes and failures of others.

The College and Its Core Curriculum

Berea College itself is a relatively small (enrollment 1400) residential institution emphasizing an educational program with a liberal arts foundation and outlook. Founded in 1855, the college has a well-articulated series of aims called its "Great Commitments." And they include commitments to liberal arts education, to service of the Appalachian region, to interracial education, to appreciation of the dignity of labor, and to an understanding of the Christian message. In keeping with these intentional directions, the college offers 22 major programs leading to the A.B. degree and to the B.S. degree in Agriculture, Business Administration, Home Economics, Industrial Arts, and Nursing. It restricts admission to students with limited financial resources, and takes eighty percent of its students from the Southern Appalachian mountain area. Berea strives to maintain a high percentage of Black enrollees. And all students must work ten to fifteen hours each week in the labor program which provides them with an opportunity to earn part of their expenses and to develop additional skills and abilities.

In line with its "Great Commitments," and general educational thrust, Berea instituted its core curriculum in 1970. The program has four major components. Sketchily described, they include the following:

1. *Issues and Values* (two semesters): 20 sections — 20 teachers, plus 20 student associates; about 20 students per section. This is a course designed to bring all freshmen in contact with current issues, the commitments of the college, and the role of values. Its aim is also to encourage freedom of expression, as well as ease and competence in oral and written communication. It attempts to provide close contact with a faculty member early in the freshman year.

2. *Man and the Arts* (two semesters): 15 sections — 15 teachers, plus 15 student associates; about 30 students per section. This course introduces students to artists and works of art. It encourages work in various media, assuming

that if students understand their own creative processes, they can then more fully appreciate the contribution of all the arts to individuals and communities.

3. *Religious and Historical Perspectives* (two semesters): 12 sections — 12 teachers, plus 12 student associates; about 30 students per section. A course designed to assist in the student's grasp of chronology and sense of perspective through exposure to selected eras as seen through primary source material by leading figures from each period (e.g. Augustine, Dante, Marx, Freud, etc.). Selection of material is made with a view to strengthening the student's understanding of the Judeo-Christian heritage; discovering new dimensions of the human spirit; realizing the impact of time and place on the individual, and vice-versa.

4. *Senior Course, the Christian Faith in the Modern World* (one semester): 5 sections — 5 teachers, plus 5 student associates; about 30 students per section. A "cap-stone" course providing an opportunity to further the development of the student's interpretive and reflective capacities concerning aspects of the general topic described in the course title. Here students select one course from among five which are different among themselves, but whose orientations and objectives are similar.

Origin of the Faculty Development Project

The Berea College interdisciplinary faculty development program is the off-shoot of a review procedure mandated by the college faculty at the inception of what is still referred to as "the new curriculum" in 1970. The adoption of the curricular changes specified that the new system would be reviewed regularly so that the faculty could make further adjustments. And so, during the academic year spring/fall 1973, a fifteen member review committee examined the new studies program using as their resource personal inquiries and observations, various questionnaires, testing instruments and studies.

On the whole, the general concept of the core curriculum was upheld by both faculty and student body in the 1970 review. However, criticisms were many. Relative to the focus of this paper, it was observed in the committee report, that on the average, faculty members felt somewhat overextended by the extra preparation and staff meetings required by the courses reaching outside the more limited interests dictated by their respective areas of specialization. The conclusion resulting from this observation was that ". . . the college must either allocate additional resources to these courses or reduce efforts to provide such courses." Unwilling to the do the latter, the review committee adopted the former line of action. The result was a proposal to the Mellon Foundation for funding of a five-year series of summer workshops and released time projects designed to help the core faculty members better prepare themselves for interdisciplinary work. The grant was secured. And in 1974 the development project began.

Yet another review of the interdisciplinary courses was held in 1976-'77.

This time it employed the services of an outside consultant from the National Endowment for the Humanities. His report, which uncovered abiding weaknesses as well as some significant improvements in the Berea program, resulted in the commissioning of still another in-house review committee. This in turn issued in a second proposal to the Mellon Foundation — this time to continue the faculty development program begun in 1974. The proposal was accepted. So the grant and the program were renewed through 1983.

The Faculty Development Program

The Berea core faculty program has four main ingredients. A brief review of their particulars will further clarify specific directions taken by our core courses, as well as elucidate the program itself.

1. *Summer workshops:* As indicated earlier, these are the center piece of the project. Generally, workshops have involved the services of an outside consultant. Attendance by core staffers has been mandatory. But for attending each participant has been given a modest *per diem* stipend, plus the books on the workshop's required reading list. Since 1974 the Issues and Values staff has attended seminars on values clarification, ethics, the teaching of English composition, classical theories of value, Appalachian and Black history and culture. During the same time period, Man and the Arts workshops have studied myth and the arts; art and myth in China and Japan; non-mainstream music, art and literature; and the film medium as an art form. The sophomore core staff of Religious and Historical Perspectives has concentrated its seminar efforts on refinement of the course's structure, on the scientific revolution, the political and industrial revolutions of the 19th century, on medieval philosophy and theology, and on modern developments in biology. Finally, the summer sessions of the Senior Course have directed their energies towards analysis of specific (mainly biblical) texts.

2. *Released Time and Grants for Study at Graduate Centers:* Availing themselves of this feature of Berea's core faculty development program, several instructors during each of the last five years have used Mellon funding to finance courses and living expenses during a semester or two at graduate centers, with the purpose of filling in background useful to teaching one of the core courses. More specifically, members of the Agriculture, Nursing, Drama, Music, English, Classical Languages, and Philosophy and Religion departments have taken courses in Ethics and Public Policy, Japanese Culture and Religion, Art History, Modern Drama, European Intellectual History, the Scientific Revolution, and Medieval Culture. These studies have taken place at graduate centers in locations ranging from the nearby University of Kentucky to Cambridge University in England.

On return from such studies, each of those directly benefitting from this facet of the program has been invited by the dean to share learnings by offering a faculty lecture for the purpose. And, as one might expect, almost inevitably

insights are further shared at the weekly staff meetings usually conducted in the various courses.

3. *Staff Meetings:* The meetings (usually weekly) provide an opportunity for sharing and discussing insights, as well as teaching techniques, discussion topics, etc. Frequent meetings foster an essential sense of unity and *espirit de corps* among staff members.

4. *Teaching Associate Training:* Here the Issues and Values freshman course, chiefly through the agency of the college library, has developed a library training program, through which the library staff instructs the twenty or so I& V teaching associates in manipulation of resource material in the college library. The two-hour per week program lasts a full month. Having completed it, the associates are then ready to pass on the instruction to the students in their particular sections of the freshman course. They do so in a series of individualized, hands-on appointments in the library, as they help students launch their second-term research projects.

Impact of Development Program on College and Faculty

Hard evidence of direct impact of the faculty development program is difficult to come by; and its assessment must be largely subjective. However, it might be recalled that the 1973 review of the core courses (before the institution of the faculty development program) complained several times that for example ". . . the staff is not profesionally prepared for such diversity of material." Perhaps significantly for assessment efforts, this same complaint appeared nowhere in the '77-'78 review. Such notable absence may be the result of the faculty development project, or simply that of longer association with the core program.

Effectiveness indications of a softer nature are to be found in recent modifications of the interdisciplinary courses; they might be found too in general faculty interchange and in core course staff meetings. Finally a gradually shifting faculty attitude and instructors' comments attest to the effectiveness of the development program.

The fact is that following summer workshops and released time grants for key course participants (such as chairpersons or planning committee members), significant alterations have taken place in the structure and content of Berea's interdisciplinary studies program. For instance goals and objectives of individual courses have been more clearly defined. The quality and relevance of common readings have improved. Typical changes have the course in question undergoing severe editing which discards deadwood so that general course overextension is minimized.

The effect of the faculty development program can be felt too in seminar sessions themselves, as well as in subsequent staff meetings. We've found that the process of bringing together faculty from diverse disciplines over a common academic focal point where none is really a specialist induces people, who

might not otherwise do so, to let down their academic guards and enter into exchanges where ignorances are admitted and genuine conversation takes place. The process also has a multiplier effect, as participants relate the new material to their own fields, and so begin to teach one another. This mutual instruction extends beyond summer workshops to weekly staff meetings and to the faculty lounge.

Furthermore, a new understanding of what it means to teach shows signs of emerging as a result of the program at Berea. Whereas the usually accepted (though largely unspoken) idea of college teaching is that it consists in passing on to undergraduates what one has learned in graduate school and subsequent reading and professional experiences, that idea is more and more called into question as interests develop outside limited fields of specialization. At least some are beginning to view their formal studies as simply learning to learn. And teaching and its preparation are increasingly seen as the broadening of one's excessively limited interests. A standard but revealing faculty comment about Religious and Historical Perspectives, for example, is that despite any shortcomings from the student viewpoint, it is a great education for the instructor.

The library instruction program for teaching associates is the most easily assessed component of the faculty development project. Here a pre-test, post-test system administered to all freshmen has been very valuable. It has revealed the high degree of effectiveness accompanying individualized tutoring of freshmen in library skills. The testing system has also pointed up weaknesses in the instruction program; and thus has occasioned appropriate changes. Naturally, this feature of faculty development has inevitable ripple effects on research projects pursued in most of the college's courses subsequent to the freshman year.

Summary of Learnings About What Works

What follows is a list of some of the more important learnings gleaned from Berea's interdisciplinary faculty development program over the last five or six years.

1. *It is beneficial to repeatedly evaluate the core program.* As indicated earlier, the Berea core faculty development program was the direct result of such evaluation. Excessive introspection, however, should be avoided. Programs should be given a chance before they are altered.

2. *It is important to plan well in advance of the faculty development workshop.* We have stumbled on this point more than once. The schedules of outside facilitators fill up quickly. Potential faculty participants schedule conflicting plans if sufficient notice is not given. The books and other reading material necessary to make a seminar worthwhile need time to arrive and to be studied.

3. *Provision of stipends for participants is helpful.* The Mellon funding has made this possible for Berea. It helps both attendance and morale.

4. *It is desirable to have cooperation among the various core staffs in development projects.* That is, if possible, provide a single development experience for the participation of the entire core staff. This is less desirable during the earlier organizational stages of the core program. However, as time goes on, it becomes helpful to make the individual courses more interdisciplinary among themselves. To date Berea has taken only very tentative steps in this direction. This is because of subtle resistance to such cooperation (indicating perhaps, its need). Even in interdisciplinary programs, boundary lines marking off one discipline from the other are staked out and jealously guarded.

5. *It is more effective to use as much local talent as possible.* Our workshop programs have had some lackluster experiences when they have depended exclusively on guidance provided by outside specialists acting as facilitators. On the other hand, almost uniformly the experiences have been beneficial when college faculty members and the workshop participants themselves have done the instructing. The best formula seems to be: devote 2/3 of the workshop to seminar-type sessions at which workshop participants carry the load of making formal presentations; give 1/3 to an outside facilitator either before or after the faculty has instructed itself. In any case, *active participation* by the core staff is a *sine qua non* requisite.

6. *It helps to keep track of development material and information for those who subsequently join the staff.* By now at Berea, we provide a whole small library of books, reprints, and classroom teaching aids for new staffers who have missed the development experiences of the past five years.

Conclusion

As can be seen from the foregoing, the ingredients for a relatively successful core faculty development program are many. Though funding is important, and planning is essential, they take a back seat to other indispensible prerequisites. These include support from the general faculty for the core ideal in the first place. Even more important is commitment from the faculty staffing the interdisciplinary courses themselves. This, of course, entails selective recruitment on the part of the dean and on that of core chairpersons. Similarly, support from the college administration in backing the interdisciplinary courses is necessary, as the courses pass over their rough spots and endure the slings and arrows of those out-of-sympathy with them.

To provide all of this, there must be a guiding vision. This was supplied in Berea's case by the most recent core review committee. In its report it said, "Given the allegiance of faculty to specific disciplines and departments, the fundamental idea of a college demands that there be some structure within which faculty can engage colleagues and students from other disciplines in topics that transcend their narrow interests."

The faculty development program described in this paper has at least nudged our staff towards this ideal.

Developing and Challenging Faculty Through Interdisciplinary Teaching-Learning

ALVIN M. WHITE

Introduction

This Project, which began as the personal vision of a few, has now become a major part of faculty culture. Approaches which were viewed with skepticism are now accepted and expected. Ideas about meaningfully integrating the sciences and the humanities which were on the radical fringes of academe are now in the mainstream of desired educational outcomes. Faculty members who were isolated in their attempts at transdisciplinary integration are now admired and supported.

Although the project is successful and has a broad base of support and acceptance, its goals have not been fully achieved or accepted by everyone. We did not, however, intend to convince everyone. The project began as a personal effort of a few and grew in a natural way to involve many others in a more comprehensive program.

Beginnings

Michael Polanyi in *Personal Knowledge* states:

'I start by rejecting the ideal of scientific detachment . . . I regard knowing as an active comprehension of the things known, an action that requires skill . . . Such is the personal participation of the knower in all acts of understanding. . .'

When I read these words I began to understand my own puzzlement and discomfort about teaching and learning. I became aware of the discrepancy between the subject as it exists in the classroom, and as it lives and grows in the imagination of real people. My awareness of the discrepancy was reinforced by Polanyi's description:

'. . . as we pursue scientific discoveries . . . on their way to the textbooks . . . we observe that the intellectual passions aroused by them appear

Alvin M. White is Director of the Interdisciplinary Holistic Teaching Learning Project at Harvey Mudd College, Claremont, California.

gradually toned down to a faint echo of their discoverer's first excitement at the moment of Illumination. . .

A transition takes place here from a heuristic act to the routine teaching and learning of its results . . . The impulse which in the original heuristic act was a violent irreversible self-conversion of the investigator . . . will . . . assume finally a form in which all dynamic quality is lost.'

Descartes, A.N. Whitehead, I.I. Rabi, Harold Taylor, and others used essentially similar ideas to describe the usual or normal education. These reflective scholars and scientists expressed their dissatisfaction in words that I recognized as reality. I responded by seeking ways that would make a difference.

Finding sympathetic colleagues was surprisingly easy. Just below the surface of compartmentalized academic knowledge there would seem to be a large reservoir of common interests. Our group and range of discussion topics expanded together. We discussed Science and Human Values, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions in Geology, Non-Darwinian Evolution, Subjectivity in Science, and other topics. The group eventually numbered thirty.

We became convinced that the teaching that we do should honestly reflect the interdisciplinary structure of knowledge. We believed that faculty members, as well as students, suffer because of the traditional narrow organization of education. We also believed that a narrow focus on technical content diminishes comprehension of the technical content itself. None of us, however, felt broadly enough educated or bold enough to attempt a radical reorganization of our teaching. Some assumed that any essential broadening of the syllabi of our regular courses was impossible.

The FIPSE Project Grant*

Twenty of us from twelve disciplines and the six Claremont Colleges applied to the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education to support our mutual education and collaborative efforts to make our teaching interdisciplinary. The first proposal was unsuccessful. One reviewer wrote that it was "trivial"; another declared it "impossible"!

After our second proposal was accepted we organized interdisciplinary seminars that would bring faculty from different departments together. The topics were Sociobiology, Artificial Intelligence, and Science and Literature of the Seventeeth Century. For reasons which are not relevant here, the project was not publicized to the wider community during the first year. Announcements about lectures and seminars were mailed to the group of twenty. Somehow the list of faculty and students who wanted to participate and receive the announcements quickly doubled again and again. By May of the first year the project involved over two hundred.

The questions and comments stimulated many faculty to see their own subjects in new ways and to find new colleagues which whom to collaborate or

argue. As they left the early meetings, philosophers asked physicists about the latest interpretation of quantum mechanics so that they could adapt their philosophy. Conversely, physicists asked philosophers how to understand Aristotle, or the meaning of a statement of Descartes, or of Newton. The reductionist hypothesis was a point of contention at the Artifical Intelligence seminars. New groups and relations formed. The new groups discovered cooperative tasks and projects which would not be feasible for individuals. Many individuals were inspired to find interdisciplinary connections to their regular subjects and courses.

Questions of content led to questions of form. As our concept of knowledge broadened, many of us became concerned with the processes of teaching and learning. The insights gained while preparing for a faculty Seminar on Structuralism led to a semester-long series of lunch-discussions about expository writing. We concluded that teaching and learning writing cannot be mechanistic or sequential exercises, but must be approached holistically.

Two-day conferences were organized in January 1978 and 1979. The first, on "Learning Styles and Student Development," dealt with the variety of learning styles and with Piaget's development stages. Fifty faculty attended. The second, on "How We Learn and How We Teach," was attended by ninety faculty from Claremont and other colleges as far away as Texas. Jonathan Warren of the Educational Testing Service spoke on those higher level skills that professors hope will be learned by students. Robert Karplus of Lawrence Hall of Science spoke on teaching students to reason. Both Warren and Karplus found that professors did not explicity attend to their stated educational goals. The Project on Teaching Undergraduate Sociology of the American Sociological Association was described. A workshop on improving teaching skills also was a part of the January 1979 conference.

The responses to the conferences, and especially the workshop, were enthusiastic. Other colleges arranged to duplicate the workshop at their home campuses. The workshop dealt with teaching and classroom problems such as Setting a Learning Climate, How to Encourage Participation and Interaction, Developing Questionning Strategies, Leading Discussions, etc. Many reported making immediate use of the new skills and insights. This workshop was the first of its kind for most of the faculty who attended.

Impact of Sharing

The success of the project illustrates the power of ideas — more, it illustrates the power of *shared* ideas. If possible, each announcement includes one, two or three pages of explanation, summary, or a personal letter about the announced subject. This is sometimes followed by a report after the meeting or seminar. The announcements are mailed to all 700 faculty in Claremont and to about 100-300 faculty, students, and others in the area and beyond. Everyone does not attend. Almost everyone, however, reads the announcements. Many respond

by mail or phone with requests for reprints or bibliographies, etc. Some have told me that they save the announcements and reports as a resource which they share with friends. Several faculty have remarked that this project is the most exciting thing in Claremont that they can remember.

A source of wonder and surprise is that faculty of the project have begun to talk to each other and are willing and anxious to share their knowledge in an atmosphere free of threat or competition. The openness which characterizes our activities is, I think, largely attributable to the relationships of the project. Genuine respect for everyone's contribution encourages a willingness to share ideas, talents, and accounts of experiences. Several professors have related how skeptical or cynical they were when confronted with new ideas, and how they gradually converted. The ideas of this project are examples of such new ideas. The coming together of professors and students from different disciplines leads to discussions which must be free of jargon. When we can understand each other, we discover many points of contact and similarities. The original theme of interdisciplinary and mutual aid still permeates most of our activities.

Traditional faculty development is not explicitly mentioned. Faculty grow and develop while participating in the seminars, discussions, and workshops.

Differences

This program differs from some others which describe themselves as "faculty development." Those programs usually involve individual faculty members who want to improve particular courses or particular teaching skills. This project is concerned ultimately with individual faculty and their students, but the whole campus and beyond are involved. The shared expertise, experiences, and ownership, the easy fellowship at discussions which include a diversity of disciplines, all contribute to an elevated sense of excitement.

The hope is that individual professors will work toward transforming their courses toward a more inclusive, interdisciplinary approach, and that their students will comprehend a greater appreciation of the subject. While learning more about interdisciplinarity, the effort to reach one's students leads to concern of how to be a more effective teacher. This, in turn, leads to questions of how students learn and develop.

Perhaps only a few professors have the time or commitment to make the effort needed to transform their courses. But those few who do are supported by many. The successful transformation of each course is an example that inspires emulation. The project has created a collegial ambience that encourages such efforts and experimentation.

Examples

A professor who used to lecture only about technical chemistry is now leading discussions about the history and philosophy of science in that same

course. His example has inspired psychologists to adapt those ideas for their courses. Art history and environmental science have joined for a study of the desert. Literature now includes the Scientific Revolution. Piaget's theories contribute to Literary Criticism. Philosophy and History influence Sculpture.

Seminars and workshops on how to introduce ethical questions into chemistry, into physics, or as part of other courses were organized in response to general interest and specific requests. The diversity of disciplines and viewpoints was natural and essential.

Realities

Concern has been voiced for the careers of individuals who accept the challenge of innovation. Experiences in Claremont have been happy ones. There are many cases where involvement in the project has been a positive factor in securing tenure, promotion, or a position.

There are still faculty who feel inhibited by real or imagined opposition, or the fear of ridicule of their innovations. In its early days the project was greeted with disdain by some. Many critics have now either been won over or neutralized. Many formerly aloof and skeptical faculty — scientists, humanists, and artists — eventually joined their colleagues because they perceived the program to be interesting, meaningful and exciting. Their participation occurred in a natural, voluntary way. Some of those who were most aloof are now actively participating with suggestions.

Process

The visible, open format of the program invites all freely to identify and associate with it. Many professors feel free to share their ideas and experiences. The positive reactions encourage others to participate. Many professors and students evidently carry within them an ideal of education or learning. The nonideological, pluralistic spirit of the program is compatible with these personal ideals. Each of us can relate to the opportunities of the program.

The project started and succeeded in response to explicit and implicit yearning of faculty for a new structure of knowledge and education, and for colleagues with whom to share their ideas. Unobtrusive leadership respected faculty responses and needs, and was, in turn, respected and trusted. The leadership was and is motivated by an inner ideal and a sense of dedication to educational reform. The effort and organizational energy of the project direction are guided and reinforced by feedback from enthusiastic colleagues. Rising expectations of the director and other faculty guide future activities.

The Future

The involvement of more students will give everyone greater insight into the processes of learning and teaching. A large number of students sharing with

faculty a sense of elevated excitement will create a special educational environment.

The efforts of faculty and administrators on other campuses to emulate this program are encouraging. The conversion of each skeptic in Claremont is a victory for quiet persuasion.

Essential Elements

It is risky to depend upon a detailed procedure or formula for the success of any program. Some elements might be considered essential for the success of the program described in this essay.

An energetic, responsive, unobtrusive leader is important. A supportive, or at least nonobstructive administration allows a program to grow and flourish. A program is coherent if held together by mutual trust and even caring about each other. Shared ideas and shared needs shape a successful program. The evolution of a program should be allowed to follow its natural growth path.

The difference between an exciting and a lackluster program is probably some kind of inspiration. Those involved in an exciting program are motivated by or dedicated to some ideal of education and learning. Even though this inner vision may be difficult or impossible to describe explicitly, it guides the lucky ones.

The Role of a Faculty Committee in Facilitating Faculty Development

ALFRED ROMER

Few faculty members will question the intrinsic value of a faculty thumb in every academic pie. One cannot imagine a more suitable body than a faculty committee to facilitate faculty development. Nevertheless it is an interesting experience to be thrust into the kitchen to devise a new pie which should be palatable to the faculty tongue and nourishing to the academic body.

The implications of the metaphor are exact. Although they need not be in conflict, the separate interests of the faculty and of the college are not necessarily congruent. It is a nice question whether a faculty committee, or indeed a committee of any kind, is the proper organ for reconciling them. The value of a committee is that it spreads responsibility, but by the same token, a committee is always a clumsy device. If it is small it can act quickly, but what it does may be unacceptably tendentious. If it is large it will act slowly, and then may generate nothing but half-measures. If it is composed entirely of faculty, its members may not be able to look beyond their immediate professional concerns to discover the needs of the institution.

A committee is often a clumsy device, but faculty development requires the participation of the faculty. That participation is a shade more likely when faculty have been involved in planning and operation. If a committee is well selected, if its members manage to work together, if it develops a sense of institutional responsibility, then perhaps something will come of its efforts. As all those *if's* imply, the proposition remains a gamble. With luck, maybe half of a committee's decisions will be fruitful. With gambler's luck, it may wind up ahead.

This optimistic, or at least hopeful view, is based on the experience of a committee in managing faculty development at St. Lawrence University. The committee was slow, it happened to be capable, and it was also lucky. It took a year and a half to accomplish anything worth mentioning, it then produced an admirable plan of operation; only a part of its plan worked, but that part worked well. In retrospect, its mishaps were probably as instructive as its successes.

Alfred Romer is Professor Emeritus of Physics and Chairman of the Academic Resources Board, St. Lawrence University, Canton, N.Y.

This committee was set up in the fall of 1974 to administer a grant of $200,000 for faculty development and renewal, made to St. Lawrence by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. St. Lawrence is an independent, liberal arts college, coeducational from its founding in 1856, with 2200 undergraduate students. It is located in Canton, a village and township settled by Vermonters on their way west, in the dairy country of St. Lawrence County in northern New York.

The committee had been carefully selected, and it was intentionally, even extravagantly representative. Its nine members came from nine different departments, and they ranged in age and experience from an assistant professor with an unfinished dissertation to a senior citizen recently retired from an endowed chair. When it met to take stock of its situation, it found itself with nine different views of what faculty renewal implied and how it was brought about.

We were urged to promote the improvement of teaching. We were urged to support scholarship. We were urged to encourage re-education. We were urged to look beyond individuals and aim our effort at departments. We were urged that our mission lay with the University as a whole. We disputed whether the improvement of teaching lay in universal classroom techniques or in particular ways of presenting the subject matter of particular courses. We disputed whether refreshing ourselves in our familiar specialities should count as renewal, or whether we should be rescuing our colleagues from obsolescent departments by retraining them in new and relevant disciplines.

Swirling among these dynamic ideas lay a mild suggestion that we try a pilot program with a small fraction of our funds, inviting proposals from our collegues to see what sort of projects they might invent. The suggestion was not welcome. It was promptly pointed out that we could hardly address ourselves to the faculty when we had neither a philosophy of renewal nor a definitive set of guidelines.

This was an objection which was as reasonable as it turned out to be impractical. We were so fair-minded, compassionate, and imaginative that we found worthy exceptions to every general proposition or salutary rule which appeared. It was the inexorable pressure of the academic calendar which led us finally to acquiesce in a pilot program, limited to ten percent of our grant; and we announced our willingness to fund individual or group projects which might qualify as faculty renewal under a brief set of wide-ranging guidelines.

The faculty was willing to play our game. We received twenty-four proposals from twenty-six persons and agreed to fund thirteen of them. Yet even after this winnowing, the projects we accepted were disappointingly ordinary. It was particularly discouraging that none of them had to do with the improvement of teaching.

It was evident that we were suffering from the practical defects of our philosophic virtues. We were so admirably large and representative a group that

it was impossible for us to reach any significant agreement or to lead our colleagues in any profitable direction. Yet philosophic virture managed to triumph. When we reassembled in the fall of 1975, we found that we were in business. The disappointing pilot program had given us useful experience. We had learned what the faculty would do of its own accord, and where we should have to take the initiative. We had handled some actual proposals, and the debates they provoked had sharpened our ideas of what might or might not be worth encouraging. In some mysterious way our plaguing differences had vanished. We no longer had to choose among our various ideas. We would adopt them all.

The following weeks confirmed the value we now placed on our diversity. By mid-February we had executed the first item in our charge and constructed a systematic plan of faculty renewal. It had been a genuinely collective accomplishment. All of us had worked on every part of it.

Briefly, we proposed to spread the grant over a total of four years, and to apportion it among four programs, two of which would go by themselves and two of which we should have to manage. A little more than half our funds would support faculty projects, another twenty percent, projects of departmental renewal. We should have to do no more than advertise these, the other two would be directed by subcommittees. The subcommittee on the improvement of teaching would have fifteen percent of our funds to maintain a system for evaluating classroom performance, to conduct workshops and seminars, and engage consultants. The remaining eight percent would go to a committee on faculty renewal, primarily for a series of lectures, both by outsiders and by our own faculty, to bring new ideas to the campus and promote their discussion.

What we devised was undoubtedly a good plan in the sense that the University would have gained if we had carried it out as written. It was not a good plan in a more practical sense. Three of our four programs were more ambitious than we could bring off. Nevertheless, we had gambler's luck. The fourth prospered and profitably absorbed all our unused funds.

The subcommittee on the improvement of teaching was moderately successful. They brought to the campus the IDEA program from the Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development in Manhattan, Kansas. In this, instructors lay out their own sets of intentions and expectations, and the student responses to the evaluation questionnaire are scored against those goals rather than against some ideal norm. It was used by a reasonable proportion of the faculty. In addition, the subcommittee conducted a summer workshop followed by a series of academic-year seminars, which were attended by a small, but diligent and enthusiastic group. Their enthusiasm did not spread, however, and there were no takers for a second round. As for the IDEA evaluations, when our Mellon grant neared its end, they were transferred to a standing committee of the faculty which has allowed them to lapse.

The subcommittee on University renewal began vigorously. Their first two

distinguished visitors to the campus were well managed in terms of the lectures they gave, the classes they visited, the seminars they conducted, and their accessibility to students and faculty, and their lectures were well received. The extension of the program to lecturers from our own faculty was never carried out, and all of it came to an end after the first year. At the same time an independent series of lectures produced a similar response. It was arranged by an interdisciplinary faculty group consisting of an anthropologist, a biologist, a paleontologist, and psychologist, funded with a grant from our general program to bring outside lecturers on contemporary topics in evolution. Again the series was well managed, the lectures were well received, but the project was neither continued or imitated. It seems clear that no one, either on or off the committee set any great store by lectures.

As for departmental renewal, we funded a number of projects and rejected a few as inadequate, but we never spent what we budgeted, and the projects we supported were not particularly interesting.

In the end, well over eighty percent of our grant went to individual faculty members, either singly or as members of interdepartmental groups. This part of our program deserves more than casual notice.

From the time we began full-scale operations, our program of individual grants was directed by two overriding concerns: a tight-fisted determination to make our money go as far as possible, and a tenacious desire to use it for faculty renewal.

To promote renewal, the guidelines we issued to the faculty expressed our preference for projects that would lead to a broader understanding of an established discipline or to some understanding of a new discipline. We preferred new projects to the continuation of work already begun, and we strongly preferred projects which would take people away from the home campus. We asked that projects be related to present or future classroom activities, and that they set realistic and attainable goals. We required that the project be carried out while the faculty member was entirely freed from campus responsibilities

That freedom could be obtained during a sabbatical leave, which might be for one semester at full pay or for a full year at half pay. It could be obtained during the three-month summer vacation. It could also be obtained during our Interterm in January, a one-course-for-one-month interpolation between the regular semesters, since each year one-third of the faculty had no Interterm duty. To stretch our funds, we indicated that we would not pay stipends for lost salaries, either for full-year sabbaticals or for summer work. We would pay out-of-pocket costs for travel, for tuition or fees, for food and lodging away from home, and in limited amounts for expendable supplies including books.

Under these guidelines, within these restrictions, and with the slack provided by our other programs, we were able to stretch our support of individual projects over five years of operation. During this time, we funded seventy-one

projects involving sixty-four faculty members, a bit over forty percent of our faculty. Our smallest grant was for $200 on a modest summer project in our pilot program. Our largest was for $8300 on a full-year sabbatical with heavy tuition. Interterm grants, which always involved travel, ran around $800. Summer grants varied widely on either side of a median of $1200. For sabbaticals, the median was $5000.

What did we get for our money? In a few cases we stretched our guidelines to cover the kind of continuing, formal scholarship which they normally excluded, in some others we helped open new lines of research. For several applicants we provided an opportunity to slip from one speciality to another within their disciplines, for several we supplied the means for broadening or deepening their interests. We sent people to short-period workshops and to international conferences. We have financed a good deal of travelling: to Japan, Thailand, Israel, Kenya, to Syracuse and Montreal nearby, to Atlanta and Berkeley farther afield. We have supported the transcription of manuscripts in the Folger Library and the search for ammonites and gastropods in the northern Great Plains. Our clients have been concerned with the psychology of infants and toddlers and with the problems of aging and death.

Some of our money may have been misspent. Some of it may have gone for busy work of no real importance. Some projects may have been proposed for no deeper purpose than to share the fun. Yet even at the most superficial level, we did set our colleagues thinking about something beyond the grades for this semester and the syllabus for next. A substantial fraction of our faculty was taken out of its normal routine and turned to activities which, however much they represented a change of pace, were still professional.

Some of these things would have been done without us, but a good many were undertaken because of the incentive we supplied. It was not that folk could make money off us. Most of those who accepted our grants were out of pocket before their projects were finished. What we did was trim the margin for them, assume enough of the expenses so they could afford their adventures. Some of our clients were eager and waiting for the opportunity, many were ready to grasp it when it appeared, for others no opportunity had existed until our program created it.

It may be presumptuous to draw lessons from experience when so much of it was happenstance. Nevertheless, what happens by luck today can often be repeated by design tomorrow.

We were fortunate from the beginning in the composition of our committee. It was an articulate and opinionated group, but all of us were also capable of listening. Our numbers and diversity made us administratively clumsy, which actually worked to our advantage. We were forced to limit our meetings to single hours tucked into inconvenient niches in the calendar, but that gave us a productive alternation of active and fallow periods, of discussion and digestion.

We were clever or lucky or both in avoiding a premature deadline and taking

time to come to terms with one another before we settled into our job. We were clever or lucky in our use of a pilot program to come to terms with our situation before we had committed ourselves too deeply.

We were undoubtedly correct in laying out our four-part program of faculty renewal, even though three of the four parts were disappointing in their execution. Everyone knows that poor teaching is deplorable. Everyone knows that departments need to reassess their goals and reevaluate their offerings. Everyone recognizes the need for campus-wide stimulation. If we had not offered assistance in these directions, we should have been roundly criticized. We did offer it, in fact we furnished as much as the community demanded, and having done our duty, we were free to spend the bulk of our money where it was needed.

The fact is that the abiding concern of the faculty is with their disciplines, not simply the subjects they teach, not simply the research they have carried out, but with that whole system of knowing and understanding within which those activities are embedded. What is more, the job of a faculty member is a curiously personal one. We are in part members of a community. As we must or care to, we attend meetings, sit on committees, plan curricula. We do our duty publically; but when we do our work we do it behind closed doors. Whether we are studying, investigating, planning, or teaching, it is our private view of the subject which prevails. From the broad chaos of knowledge we try to draw comprehensible webs, woven as we perceive the relationships to lie.

In these terms, we need not apologize for devoting so much of our money to individual projects. It went where it was wanted, and perhaps it went where it was needed. If it did go where it was needed, then we can thank the circumstances which stretched our operations over a five-year period.

We never had to worry about the ambitious and the eager. The folk we wanted to reach were the duty-bound who needed to be released and the dead-ended who needed a fresh start. We wanted clean breaks for them, away from the home campus and its distractions, and since we wanted to ship them out, we had to wait until they were free to go. The number of faculty who can go off duty at any one time is strictly limited. Departmental programs have their demands, so do families, so do house and property. The longer we could operate, the more likely it was that we were still around when this or that person was disengaged.

In this business of reaching the hesitant and the encumbered, there was another circumstance which worked in our favor. In general the funds we allotted were reasonably matched to the demands for them, and we could support most of the proposals which came to us. We can take some credit for pruning budgets and stretching allotments during the first rush, but later that even balance simply occurred. We made no public point of this, but neither did we create any throng of disappointed applicants to spread the word that Mellon grants were hard to get.

This is our story. We began awkwardly, we planned magnificently, what we achieved was different from our plan, and somehow we managed to influence a considerable number of our colleagues. What we did was shaped by local circumstances. The only generalization we dare to make is this: Be prepared for the unexpected and ride your luck.

Corporate Faculty Development: Enhancing Collegiality on Campus

BRUCE HAYWOOD

To use the term "faculty development" is almost certainly to evoke immediate throughts of ways in which individuals might enlarge their capacities to do work in their discipline. Even before the term became prominent in the vocabulary of higher education, most institutions encouraged faculty members to activities which would presumably improve them in their role as specialists. Whether by making grants of money or grants of time, our colleges and universities came increasingly to support the idea of continuous professional renewal. Most particularly, in their broad adoption of sabbatical leave programs — the deliberate, periodic separating of professors from their ordinary duties in order to return them, in effect, to the activity of graduate student — our institutions displayed their commitment to the belief that their vitality depends upon their faculty's remaining powerful in disciplinary competencies, current in scholarship, and involved with the work being done on the research frontiers.

There is nothing, surely, in that nearly universal assumption that anyone would wish seriously to quarrel with. There is something of a self evident truth in the statement that a vital college means a vital faculty and all who have professed for several years can attest to the need for faculty members to have opportunities to return to full-time study and research, to discover again the joy of unqualified engagement in free inquiry. And yet, is not this notion of faculty development, focusing exclusively upon the individual's special competency, too narrow? It would seem to be rooted in the conviction that the only true responsibility of the faculty member is to further the interest of his or her discipline. A faculty member, trying to assess the priorities of his or her institution and seeing its support of professional growth taking only such form, might be excused for believing that "faculty development" is but another way of saying "publish or perish."

To conceive of faculty responsibility only in terms of enlarging a person's authority within a discipline — and to relate all notions of faculty development then to that assumption — may be appropriate for the university. For the liberal arts college, it cannot suffice. Such a college, which assumes that its students

Bruce Haywood is Dean of the Faculty at Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio.

will be educated, generally and liberally, in accord with its principles, sets before its faculty responsibilities which go beyond the ordinary assumptions of the discipline. It must think of faculty development, then, in a larger frame.

Kenyon's committee on faculty development, gathering in 1974 to consider how the College might be strengthened through a better defined approach to faculty development, quickly became interested in the tensions within our understanding of what the professional growth of our faculty ought to mean. They are the tensions we all know daily in our courses. They are the tensions, indeed, which make the College what it wishes to be.

In the typology used by David Riesman and others, Kenyon would be classed a "university college," an undergraduate institution which moves its students quickly to advanced work in a major, pointing them to the graduate and professional schools. It has been altogether appropriate, then, for Kenyon to wish to have faculty members who can claim a considerable authority as specialists. But, while pursuing this, the "university" aspect of its character, Kenyon has wished no less to afford its students a collegiate and liberal education. For that also it holds its faculty responsible. Recognizing the double role played by the faculty at Kenyon, the committee on faculty development spoke of the implications for faculty activity of the College's commitment:

> "The College has remained true to beliefs that have ruled its life for over a century: that liberal education is necessary to an independent life; that the cultivation of the liberal arts heightens the taste and sharpens the wit of society; and that wisdom is a different and higher thing than knowledge. We have pursued knowledge, not for its own sake, but because of its usefulness in living a valuable life . . . Every day that Kenyon is in session, members of the faculty make decisions which affect the College's life. They do this as individuals, as departments, as divisions. They speak through standing committees which address virtually every aspect of Kenyon's activity. They act as a body, setting policy on the most important questions the College faces. When we say that at Kenyon the faculty is charged with the responsibility for the education of students, we voice a commitment which the College takes altogether seriously."

The consequences of Kenyon's choosing to give equal weight to "university" and "college" roles for its faculty would seem to be clear: the professor of chemistry must be a member of the College as enthusiastically and devotedly as he or she is a chemist; members of the faculty must understand and support the work of other departments as well as their own; the faculty must as a body agree on certain essential matters and be more than a political association of persons who provide special services. The implications for defining faculty development ought to be as obvious: opportunity for the professor to renew and enlarge a special competency must be matched by opportunity for him or her to develop as a *member*.

We of the committee were chagrined to recognize, as we considered Ken-

yon's practice, that the College's support of faculty development took no note of the collegiate dimension of faculty responsibility. Though the College was committing by then an annual amount, in support of sabbaticals and other programs, nearly equal to a thousand dollars per faculty member, all of it was directed towards the enhancement of individual competency. We were doing nothing directly to develop a corporate sense in the faculty, nothing to encourage members to grow in their character as professors in the College. It was as though we assumed that such growth would come of itself, with time, while the other, the disciplinary, would always need promotion and support. Ironically, then, our emphases seemed to run counter to our declared interest, following a purely university model. Once the conflict between our interest and our practice became clear to us, we resolved to seek ways to manifest the College's interest in developing the faculty as a body, as well as keeping individuals vital in their discipline. There existed, as one of my colleagues wrote, "a felt if not frequently expressed need" among the faculty for such opportunity. We were sure of broad interest and backing, provided that we could find the right formulation.

We recognized, first, that there was no structure or activity within the academic year that could be made to serve our purposes. Indeed, we were reminded just how much the forms within which we work during the academic year — the course, the department, the committee, the division — may keep us from a sense of collegiate identity. The academic year afforded neither time nor occasion for persons from diverse disciplines to study and discuss together the educational philosophy which, we assume, provides the controlling frame for their separate teaching. Much less was there opportunity for addressing questions having to do with the psychology of learning and teaching, of techniques of teaching, or of presenting values through subject matter.

Accordingly we turned quickly to thoughts of an intensive summer session of seminars on these collegiate questions, a session long enough to permit genuine engagement with the questions, short enough to guarantee sustained interest and participation. With a hundred regular members on the faculty, we resolved to involve twenty-five a year, believing that larger numbers would prevent the growth of cohesiveness among the participants and focusing of attention on vital matters. We wanted nothing to distract, nothing to prevent a colleague from participating in what we were convinced must remain a voluntary program. Over some weeks, then, there took shape the program we launched in 1975 and which ran for four summers, involving close to ninety percent of the regular faculty as well as some part-time and visiting members: an intensive two-week session of seminars, separated by enough time from the academic year that participants would have cleared the slate, but early enough in the summer that the sessions would not compete with members' plans for other work. We wanted the form to argue implicitly what we were attempting: members of the faculty being drawn together in a close engagement with

questions which surmount their departmental interest, questions of such importance as to claim their undivided attention for a two-week period.

Eager to move our program into gear, but faced with the fact that most of our own faculty development monies were committed by that time of year, we decided in the spring of 1975 to announce the program for that summer without stipends for the participants (though with a modest payment to the three seminar leaders). That was a mistake, despite the fact that volunteers stepped forward in happy number and despite the great success of that first session. I say a mistake, because the program ought at the outset to have had attached to it, in the form of due recognition of the faculty time investment, the weight of importance the administration assigned to it for the College. (A faculty member who perceives that his college is willing to put up its funds to send him to a ten-day conference on liquid crystals, while expecting him to invest his own time in its allegedly larger concerns, will draw appropriate conclusions about the institution's true priorities, whether it is a dean or a committee of his peers which decides on the allocation.) Happily, with the generous assistance of the Lilly Endowment, we were able to rectify that error in the remaining years and, in recognition of the many benefits to the College that have come from the seminars, we have agreed that our faculty development funds shall be used to provide stipends for participants in future sessions.

The form of the program accomplished all that we hoped it would. Though there were some complaints about the remarkable intensity — sessions from nine to four every weekday, with participants remaining together for lunch and with reading assignments every evening and over the weekend — most recognized that the physical arrangements did much to break down intellectual barriers. We think there was a similar accomplishment of rapid change through our having sessions in College buildings, rather than at a "retreat," but in one that members of the faculty do not ordinarily find themselves in. Though emphatically on campus, and therefore at the seat of the questions, participants were on unfamiliar and neutral ground.

From the outset we were certain that the seminars would be valuable, only if they were based upon a specific set of readings, texts which would cut across the lines of divisional or departmental interest. We were determined to avoid mere talk or what one of my colleagues called "the simple exchange of prejudices." We quickly agreed on a tripartite structure for the first year's session, focusing in turn upon three issues that were aspects of the question that has been central to the seminars in all four years: what does liberal education at Kenyon mean to the faculty today? Our next important decision was to reject the idea of having outsiders lead the sessions or even serve as resource persons. The point, we reminded ourselves, was to get Kenyon people together to wrestle with specificaly Kenyon questions. The perspective of outsiders on those topics, interesting and valuable as that might be, could prove distracting. Instead, we selected three senior members of the faculty to assume responsibil-

ity for organizing the sessions and leading the seminars. They were chosen for their established interest in the question they were to deal with, but — very importantly — they did not represent a particular point of view or speak for a certain bloc. Indeed, the three had not worked together before. That they represented three different divisions, in their departmental affiliation — Political Science, Psychology, Religion — was certainly an asset. In subsequent seminars, in fact, we ensured that no two leaders came from the same division.

Each leader was asked to select readings and materials on his respective topic, with all three then making a final approval of texts. Though texts were provided to participants well in advance, end of year pressures prevented most of them from making a start on the reading before the eve of the opening session. (In following years we made texts available many weeks ahead, with happier results, though without eliminating completely what some have seen as the problem of a very heavy reading schedule.) Each leader then had general charge of three days of the program, introducing his topic in a short address at a plenary session, though all three served as seminar leaders throughout the sessions. Seminar groups were created by a division of the participants into three, but with provision that one or two participants moved on to another group at the end of each day, thus ensuring that every participant encountered each other in a seminar during the two-week period.

The first three days were given to discussion of readings on the philosophy of liberal education, from Aristotle, Whitehead, Max Weber, Allan Bloom, and David Bell. However, the groups moved reasonably quickly from theory in the large towards the particular notion of liberal education cherished by Kenyon. The second three days were spent on the role of the teacher, discussion building on *The College Classroom* by Richard D. Mann and others. Then three days were devoted to the Kenyon student, his or her aspirations, characteristics, and accomplishments, as well as the faculty's intentions regarding the student. The final day provided opportunity to draw the threads together in plenary sessions.

The first two weeks went beyond even our high hopes. Participants were conscientious and eager. Even at lunch, discussions were pointedly professional. A leader's report summed up: "Participants did not lecture at each other; discussions were informal and conversational; there were no departmental or disciplinary hostilities in evidence; members did not use this as an occasion to defend their disciplines or attack others." It was clear that we had found the formula that worked and participants gave the program such highly favorable reports — "a unique experience . . . the best thing to happen to me at Kenyon" — that extensive participation in following summers seemed assured.

Though assigned reading in *Daedelus* and elsewhere took the place of Richard Mann in the second year (the decision of a new troika whose members had been participants in the first program), topics and format remained essentially the same and with the same pleasing results. Reports from participants,

however, made it increasingly clear that the seminars would be even more valued and would appeal to more members of the faculty, if we could engage participants directly in the processes of liberal education. Instead of a complete focus upon problem and theory, it was argued, there should be reading of some of the great books and a treating of these in a nondisciplinary and interdisciplinary fashion. The sense was very strong that faculty members should come to understand the liberal arts "by truly practicing them rather than by merely talking about them" and that participants would richly profit by seeing how a student may be brought to view a subject under the different illuminating beams of the separate disciplines.

That appropriate and happy shift in emphasis was accomplished in the third and fourth years and it drew into the seminars some who had earlier looked upon them as an exercise for educationists. With the discussions of Darwin's *Origin of Species*, Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, Chomsky's *Reflections on Language*, Kuhn's *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, there was a general sense of the intellectual level having risen, though not without some complaint that the seminars were moving away too much from local concerns. Nevertheless, our four-year experience argues persuasively that the inclusion of a work of universal implication, such as Darwin, is the best basis for interdisciplinary exchange and a guarantee of lively discourse.

Every participant was called upon at the program's end to write an evaluative report of his or her participation. Most provided thoughtful commentary on the sessions, but the best were those many reports each year which revealed what changes the writer had undergone in those packed days and their aftermath. The frankness of testimony is itself evidence of the way in which the seminars broke down barriers and removed inhibitions. To read these reports *in toto* is to be persuaded that, despite some shortcomings and disappointments, the seminars wrought a great good for Kenyon. There are some things we can claim with complete confidence: there is a far greater awareness here than there was of a corporate identity and of the nature of our corporate responsibilities; members of the faculty are more receptive to the point of view of colleagues and have a greater appreciation of other disciplines; there is an easier intercourse between divisions and departments than before. But the largest and longest lived effect of the seminars has been that members of the faculty have gained respect for colleagues and their work. Some have confessed that this respect came in the wake of the humbling recognition of the limits of their own understanding. Indeed, one might conclude from a reading of our participants' reports that true collegiality emerges only with such recognition. Many of our seminar members have written that, before their participation, they knew their colleagues only superficially, more often than not as fellow politicians in committees of faculty government. There, they have said ruefully, they saw one another at their worst!

A chief lesson for all of us has been the demonstration that we cannot take for

granted, even in an institution as small as Kenyon, the interactions and interrelationships among faculty members that are vital to the liberal arts college. We have seen the need for forms and structures that will allow members of the faculty to see the truth of their colleagues and our seminars have shown us that this can be done without fear of indoctrination, without threat to academic freedom, and at no cost to the disciplines.

The Consortium Approach to Faculty Development: The GLCA Experience

STEPHEN C. SCHOLL

No two consortia are alike. Even among those associations that have been most active in faculty development, differences in purposes, programs and impact have been more striking than similarities. If the experience of the Great Lakes College Association (GLCA) is instructive, it may be because if falls somewhere in the middle range between those cooperative organizations with no concerted effort, philosophy or focus and those whose essential activity is the delivery of professional development services (Patterson, 1974).

The GLCA is made up of twelve independent undergraduate liberal arts colleges in Ohio, Michigan and Indiana: Albion, Antioch, Denison, DePauw, Earlham, Hope, Kalamazoo, Kenyon, Oberlin, Ohio Wesleyan, Wabash and Wooster. It is governed by a board of the Presidents with representatives from a Deans' Council and a faculty Academic Council. There is a small permanent central staff (President, Vice President and secretaries) located in Ann Arbor, with additional staff elsewhere for special programs. In the 1960's the GLCA was best known for its cooperative off-campus study, with each college acting as agent for one or more international or domestic programs. There were occasional faculty development activities, such as one funded project for writing programmed instructional materials. Later, faculty could join in summer urban study seminars in Yugoslavia or Poland. In the seventies there was established the Independent Colleges Office in Washington, D.C., to aid in federal grant applications, monitor legislation and arrange for Congressional testimony. In recent years it has become common for admissions, financial aid and business officers, student deans and placement directors to meet regularly and engage in joint projects.

The bonds engendered by belonging to the same academic league are clear when faculty or administrators come together. But there are natural barriers to cooperation, too. The colleges are not convenient to one another (even midpoint, somewhere between Fort Wayne, Indiana, and Lima, Ohio, were it

Stephen C. Scholl is Dean of Educational Services, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, and formerly Director of the GLCA Faculty Development Program.

attractive, is a two- to four-hour drive for everyone). Emphases in institutional commitments and style differ. Above all, each college maintains clear autonomy. Like their faculty members, the colleges wish to be self-directed, and the GLCA has seldom been seen as an initiator. Such is a familiar dilemma for multipurpose consortia.

Late in 1973 Larry Barrett, a genial English teacher at Kalamazoo who had seen service as a sea captain and was then Acting President of GLCA, took some uncommon initiative and brought together faculty members from each college to form a task force on improving teaching. Each member of this "Professional Activities Committee" had played some role in instructional innovation on his or her home campus. The group quickly developed a proposal which, with Barrett at the helm, stayed afloat through scrutiny by the deans, Academic Council, and the board, and safely berthed at the Lilly Endowment. "Faculty development" was coming into vogue, and the Endowment had shown interest in including GLCA in the new grants it was making across the country. The GLCA project sailed forth with over $400,000 from Lilly and a matching contribution of over $200,000 from the colleges for the years 1974-1977 (Scholl, 1977).

I directed the GLCA faculty development program in those first three years, and I have some biases in its favor. Further, I am soft on educational "outcomes," as this report will show.[1] To me, professional growth (like liberal education) is a complex, organic process, a matter of life-long maturation and learning. Faculty respond better to facilitative leadership than to programming and would rather be nurtured than trained. Our colleges are idiosyncratic communities, and they too function more like organisms than like mechanical systems, and must be allowed to find their own ways. Some of us who led the GLCA project learned these lessons as we went along. Such humanistic observations notwithstanding, I am predisposed to want structure and intentionality, and I believe that some training schemes are effective in professional development when sensitively adapted to the special purposes of academe. I was trained as a historian, and I am brash enough to grow impatient when I see people reinventing wheels. But I continue to learn again and again that faculty members and colleges are most likely to use the wheels and the development schemes that they invent (or at least induce) for themselves.

The most important lesson I have learned in six years observing the GLCA is that colleges and faculty, like students, each have individual positions (maybe even "stages") in their peculiar patterns of growth and development. Even when I have a hunch about where the path of education might lead, I can only invite my colleagues to join me in their own time on their own paths. As Lance Buhl has suggested, successful consortial professional development programs

[1]The judgments in this article are mine, but I must thank several GLCA colleagues for their views which I have tried to include, especially Donn Neal, GLCA Vice President; Jim Cooper, DePauw; and Peter Frederick, Wabash.

move in cycles. They periodically assess members' needs, plan and execute three- to five-year projects, constantly evaluate themselves and prepare to move on to new tasks when faculty and colleges are ready (Buhl, 1978). Our faculty development program has been through at least one such cycle and is well on into a second.

In retrospect, the GLCA project had five major elements during 1974-1977, three of which have become cornerstones of consortial faculty development since then. The *administration* of the program — with governance, executive, communication, resource and evaluation functions — was the first priority and has proved to be a necessary but not sufficient structural component. Interinstitutional *workshops* on diverse topics became the predominant training format and continue to be the most popular activity. Faculty *fellowships* for pedagogical projects, accompanied by an extensive summer training program, were the most costly aspect of the Lilly-funded phase. A *consultant service* was attempted as an innovation in consortial self-help. Finally, a *network* of teachers who found facilitating faculty development personally rewarding grew as an ongoing community of interest.

The central goal of the GLCA program has been improved teaching, but from the beginning we recognized related professional concerns. In the fall of 1974 we consulted with the emergent experts in faculty development, from Jerry Gaff and Mervin Freedman in California to Joe Katz, Bill McKeachie and Gary Quehl in the east. We confirmed what we had already suspected: improving teaching involved discovering more about how students learn, how teachers grow and change, and how institutions can support, evaluate, and reward their faculty.

We examined the pioneering work in instructional development at Syracuse and an attempt to provide such services through a consortium circuit rider at the New Hampshire College and University Council. We borrowed workshop ideas from those developed for the College Center of the Finger Lakes by Bill Bergquist and Jack Noonan. Claude Mathis and his colleagues at the Center for the Teaching Professions at Northwestern had a Danforth grant to provide services for faculty in our twin consortium, the Associated Colleges of the Midwest. Fred Gaige was offering extensive individual professional development consultation through the Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education. Lance Buhl and Sam Lane had established the special purpose Educational Consulting Study through the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education to help institutions in northeast Ohio.

We exchanged ideas with friends in these and other programs, but hindsight suggests that we also might have benefitted from consulting with someone in organizational development such as Jack Lindquist. He describes a synthesis of models for planned change which he calls "adaptive development." Local efforts, he says, must be "stimulated and guided by the adaptation of external innovations rather than the invention of new ones." We spent a bit too much

time quickly trying untried ideas. Lindquist further specifies several necessities for disseminating innovations in educational organizations — more critical indeed when the setting is as complex as a multipurpose consortium. We had the necessary money and materials, access to external expertise and sensitive guidance on evaluation which he recommends. But we were short on time and shorter still on experience with renewal strategies, two essential ingredients. We got our experience as we went, but we will need more years to capitalize on it (Lindquist, 1978).

In the end we charted our own way, constantly enriched and informed by other projects but without a complete model for change. That we survived is noteworthy. We chose not to provide expert consultation from a central office. We believed that faculty at our colleges were suspicious of "change agents" and would identify needs too diverse for any one or two "developers." Instead we organized a project office on one of the campuses with a part-time executive director who continued to teach and a small advisory committee from five of the other institutions (including faculty, a president, a provost and the president of GLCA). We allowed applicants for fellowships to determine the focus for pedagogical projects and we tried to design workshops that would serve their many needs collectively. We designed weekend workshops for others in areas that could benefit from cooperative attention, such as student/faculty relations, urban studies, teaching modern languages and cross-displinary teaching of writing. We hired consultants as we needed them, and tried to identify internal resources where possible. In our furthest extension of this eclectic, individualized self-help approach, we tried to organize, train and utilize a loose network of some thirty to forty colleague consultants (generally senior faculty) who would be available to faculty on campuses other than their own to assist with virtually anything — grantsmanship, getting an article published, observing a class, redesigning curricula or getting along with one's chairperson. Improving teaching was always the focus, but the ways and means were diverse and varied in their effectiveness.

The case for cooperation often rests on the premise that consortial programs can meet needs of those who are minorities on any one campus but who may become supportive, productive groups when gathered together. A consortium can take educational risks beyond the means of any one member college. We took a risk. With the luxury of a substantial grant, the GLCA had launched an effort to improve teaching, knowing that the common wisdom (even among dedicated liberal educators) was and is that teachers are born, not made. In one way or another, over half of the more than 1,200 faculty in the GLCA participated during the first three years, and over two hundred attend some faculty development event off campus each year since.

Every consortium is asked perennially by its members, "What are you doing for us now?" An external review team gave us our first appraisal in 1975 under the leadership of Malcolm Parlett, visiting all of our major events and each

campus for interviews with participants, other faculty and key administrators. Parlett, an inventive researcher from Great Britain, argued for "illuminative evaluation," documentation of our attempts at innovation as they actually unfolded and description of the milieux in which they occurred. He taught us to aim at providing "a comprehensive understanding of the complex reality (or realities) surrounding the program" (Parlett and Dearden, 1977:24). The most helpful assessment of the program came in the fall of 1976, after a team of six GLCA faculty, trained by Parlett, completed visitations to each campus and wrote reports reviewed for their accuracy by each dean. The project advisory board then recommended to the Deans' Council what elements of the program should continue, what would be modified and what to drop and add.[2]

What had and had not worked? The most critical political issue was that we had been unable to involve equally all twelve colleges. Faculty members were our primary clients, but we recognized that we wanted impact on the colleges as well, and they would ultimately decide whether or not to maintain GLCA efforts in faculty development. The key seemed to be that the program was governed and directed by an advisory group representing only half of the colleges consistently, and even with rotation and expansion of the membership, two campuses were never really on the inside. We were inevitably less responsive to those not directly represented, communication was not always personalized and activity lagged. Further, even with an expanded project staff, we had been too spartan in our administrative resources. Though an excellent faculty newsletter was published, the printed word is a weak dissemination medium. We needed more circuit riding and a strong faculty liaison or two (even in addition to a dedicated dean) on each campus.

The result of these findings led us to turn to the GLCA central office, where the full-time Vice President, Donn Neal, now has faculty development as a major part of his regular job assignment. He was directed to create an ongoing advisory group made up of representatives from all campuses, and to cultivate strong lines of communication with both chief academic officers and faculty opinion leaders on each campus. The *GLCA Faculty Newsletter* has continued, but additional notices, personal contacts and ad hoc planning groups serve to devise and execute each development effort. We have yet to achieve full equality of participation, but this is surely a move in the right direction.

It was further resolved to dedicate more coordinating resources to any significant new project. Hence, the GLCA Women's Studies Program, a direct outgrowth of needs and workshops during the first three years, was the target for new grants (first from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, then from the Ford Foundation), a special governing committee,

[2]The visitation reports and subsequent recommendations are included in the November, 1977 final report cited above.

and a full-time director (Beth Reed, formerly the administrative assistant for the faculty development program).

Evaluations consistently showed that two- to three-day workshops were the most efficient and obvious approach for a consortium. Over six years GLCA has offered more than forty pedagogical or curricular workshops, ranging in size from fifteen to 150 participants with a normal attendance of thirty to fifty. The workshops are planned and conducted by small inter-campus teams, including someone from GLCA experienced in the design of such events and a faculty group with interest and expertise in the substantive area.

Workshops are most effective when they respond to a need felt at the moment on several campuses and include follow-up activities. The natural gatherings are disciplinary — psychologists or historians get together to talk shop with their small-college counterparts, usually about teaching. As a psychologist colleague told me after one such meeting, "I was skeptical about going, but I'm actually trying some new things in my intro course and I really enjoyed the chance to talk with others in similar situations." Interdisciplinary meetings can be even more exciting and productive because of the support needed by those venturing outside their home departments, as in urban or Black studies. Embattled faculty in modern languages and those from various disciplines concerned about student writing have gathered more than once because they have so much to share with and learn from one another. The urge to build a community found its greatest energy in our women's studies workshops that led to and have been the mountain-top experiences of that newer GLCA program. One man reported that the third such conference was "an inspiring personal experience. I had the distinct impression that I was part of something of ultimate significance; and it has a momentum that cannot be stopped" (Davis and McCallon, 1974; Verdun, Miller and Greer, 1977; Berquist and Phillips, 1975, 1977; Beach, 1978: 5).

Our most costly element of the project funded by Lilly, one that we chose to discontinue, was the fellowship program. In two years seventy-two faculty received stipends of $1,000 and funds for expenses to pursue pedagogical projects such as computer-assisted instruction, new courses and curricula, moral education, and various schemes to individualize learning. As a condition, each fellow attended an initial weekend workshop, a month-long summer conference and a reporting workshop the following year. Most projects were successfully completed and reported out in the faculty newsletter. Several fellows published their findings more broadly, and a few found that they were helped to make mid-career changes.

But there were problems. Stipends occasionally seemed to attract someone who needed summer income: the money would have been used better for direct individual project expenses for additional faculty, more diverse workshops, local campus initiatives and the like. A more critical mistake was our attempt to run fellows through a common course of study in faculty development with our summer conferences. Individual development grants should be separated from

training in any faculty development program. Those faculty who freely elect some learning experience are guaranteed a better experience.

While summer conferences could be caricatured as overly ambitious faculty development extravaganzas, thrilling some and alienating others, we learned much from these experiments. Besides a full range of sessions on instructional issues, we explored the design of future colleges. We included spouses and families and tried Gestalt approaches to meshing personal and professional growth. We grew competent at the use of microteaching. The experience reinforced consortial interest in professional development activities that might be aimed at faculty groups of different ages, confronting life- and career-planning issues unique to stages of adult development.[3]

One enduring product of these conferences is a one-week summer workshop on course development, offered since 1977 at Kenyon. The formula has proved to be successful. Five or six experienced leaders (most are regular faculty members) work with fifteen to twenty-four teachers who bring a course to be planned or revised. The dual goals are to work through a variety of course development stages while exploring and experimenting with teaching styles and strategies. Didactic sessions are minimal, microteaching is used on three or four mornings, and there is extensive group discussion and individual consultation. As one participant reflected, the success is due in part to "the establishment of an atmosphere of expectation, trust and concern in which the task at hand is addressed." Even two years after the first such workshop, faculty reported a resultant increased use of purposeful discussions, surveys of student needs, a "greater range of teaching methods" and "more concern with *how* I am teaching as well as what," and another responded that there was "more confidence and compassion — (the) workshop headed off disenchantment, and now I have more understanding of what I do in class and why" (Boone, 1979: 3).

It is unlikely that such a workshop would have evolved within the resources of any one campus. In fact, it seems to be unique so far. But a more important reason why this is an approach appropriate to consortial support is that it allows a safe setting for faculty to share their weaknesses as well as their strengths, and it convinces them that colleagues are concerned with teaching at institutions much like our own. The GLCA has permitted participation from a few similar institutions outside the consortium, such as Goucher, Rollins and St. Olaf, but it is difficult to keep up the ongoing support that should reinforce such a workshop through regular commerce between formally associated colleges.

The consultant service was an element of the program that never really took hold. Consultations took place, most satisfactorily for both parties. But the

---

[3]At the time of this writing GLCA is launching a pilot program in career planning for faculty with a planning grant for 1980 from the Lilly Endowment, including some experimental interinstitutional workshops.

logistics in a three-state region were difficult, and it is hard to convince people that they might really get the help they need from some foreigner, if they even remember that the service exists. What has taken its place is a network of local faculty consultants, patterned on early trials at Earlham and Denison, and now adopted by DePauw, Oberlin and Ohio Wesleyan. Some other colleges in GLCA also have one or more individuals who, with the help of a faculty development or teaching and learning committee, take extra responsibility for providing assistance to colleagues.

This network began as a small fraternity of faculty members dedicating their energies to improving instruction and now is a much larger group of individuals (most of whom were involved in the early workshops or consultant service) who come together annually for advanced study in consultation. The GLCA provides sessions on how to design local workshops, how to enhance classroom observation, helping interviews and how to utilize research on student learning. This is an ongoing training service, tailored to the needs of part-time consultants who are teachers first but who will spend two or three years in such special roles on their campuses. They are familiar and therefore more credible helpers at home. But they have a rich resource in their regular contacts with counterparts at sister colleges.

The enduring elements of the GLCA program, then, are an ongoing, substantial administrative and communication structure based in the central office but engaging all campuses, a varied program of timely workshops that meet needs on several campuses, allow risk-taking, use consortial expertise and which serve long-term concerns of the faculty; and continuing cultivation of a changing network of local consultants. The fourth cornerstone presently is the women's studies program, amply supported by the consortium and external grants. Such an emphasis will have successors as the cycle of consortial effort continues.

Like other associations, GLCA could offer its services, especially workshops, to outsiders (and it is frequently encouraged to do so). But concentrating its resources and energy within has been the obvious choice for such a multipurpose consortium. The demands for professional development provide an ample agenda for many more years in the GLCA.

References

Beach, Leslie. "Three Perspectives on Women's Life/Work Conference." *GLCA Faculty Newsletter*, May 3, 1978.

Bergquist, William H. and Phillips, Steve R. *A Handbook for Faculty Development*. Vol. I, Washington, D.C.: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1975. Vol. II, 1977.

Boone, Garrett. "Reflections on Last Summer." *GLCA Faculty Newsletter*, April 30, 1979.

Buhl, Lance. "Professional Development in the Interinstitutional Setting," in Jack Lindquist (ed). *Designing Teaching Improvement Programs*. Berkeley: Pacific Soundings Press, 1978.

Davis, Larry and Earl McCallon. *Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Workshops*. Austin, Texas: Learning Concepts, 1974.

Lindquist, Jack. *Strategies for Change*. Berkeley: Pacific Soundings Press, 1978.

Parlett, Malcolm and Gary Dearden. *Introduction to Illuminative Evaluation: Studies in Higher Education*. Cardiff-by-the-Sea, California: Pacific-Soundings Press, 1977.

Patterson, Franklin. *Colleges in Consort*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Scholl, Stephen C. *The GLCA Faculty Development Program, 1974-1977, Final Report to the Lilly Endowment*. November, 1977.

Verdun, John R., Harry G. Miller and Charles E. Greer. *Adults Teaching Adults*. Austin, Texas: Learning Concepts, 1977.

PART III

Participation In Faculty Development Activities: The Participants Speak

Participation in Faculty Development Activities: The Participants Speak

Introduction

Faculty development activities can have profound impact on faculty members. No one can better understand this impact than the faculty who have been involved in those activities and "touched" by them. In the personalized essays that follow faculty members describe in various terms the growth, renewal and revivification they have experienced from participating in different kinds of faculty development programs. Riggio notes the benefits to her teaching and scholarly activities resulting from participation in an interdisciplinary seminar on campus. Rodes discusses the importance of faculty exchange programs in helping to overcome what he calls "academic calcification." Smith describes the boost to his professional development and to his morale from being funded for travel and research activities; he adds that his research activities have enhanced both his courses and his own career. Ransom enumerates several benefits he derived from taking a colleague's course, having a colleague take his course, and then together fashioning a new interdisciplinary offering. Menefee explains the initial fear with which he greeted an administrative request to participate in an interdisciplinary course, and the true learning experience it turned out to be. He uses the term "courage" to describe the feeling he acquired from this experience. We find these essays ("testimonials," if you will) honest, inspiring, and instructive and hope the reader does also.

In Praise of an Interdisciplinary Symposium

MILLA B. RIGGIO

At the end of an impassioned (and full) introductory lecture in the first course I taught after receiving my Ph.D. — a Harvard summer school course in linguistics — I asked for questions. Only one hand was raised: the question came: "Are we going to diagram sentences in this course"?

This trivializing response, coupled with the rapid exit of students from a room in which they had been kept too long on a June morning, taught me a lesson which the last seven years have repeatedly confirmed: that the energy required for teaching well year after year must continually be renewed. Making such self-renewal possible constitutes, it seems to me, the basic motivating force of faculty development.

At Trinity College, where I teach English literature, we call this process more simply "staying alive." In the past we have distinguished personal intellectual development, which may take many forms, from the more insidious idea of faculty development as a label attached only to the immediate production of scholarly publications. Publishing, of course, does have its rewards. It enables one to carry through an argument, prove a theory, or demonstrate a set of facts in more complex detail than a classroom lecture will allow; it admits the teacher to those specialized clubs of scholars who know each other only through professional journals and conferences, thus relieving in part the loneliness and isolation of private research. Occasionally, it advances the level of knowledge in a given field. And, of course, it does enhance professional reputation.

As the recipient of a sabbatical leave extension grant from Trinity this year, I understand how important it is for colleges to support the publishing activities of their faculties. However, writing for specialized academic journals — a craftsman's work which costs as well as rewards teachers — should not become the sole basis for academic value, as it often threatens to do. Scholarly writing requires a set of skills different from but not necessarily superior to those demanded for teaching. Moreover, every hour spent writing or editing copy for

Milla Riggio is Associate Professor of English at Trinity College, Hartford, Connecticut.

publication limits precious reading or course preparation time and reduces the possibilities of intellectual disputation, which remains overall a better teaching tool than a publishing faculty. A good, well-documented and logically pursued argument about the predatory aspects of various animals or the ethical implications of the Nietzschean Superman teaches undergraduates more than most specialized scholarly articles. Keeping this central fact in mind, college administrations should eschew concepts of faculty development which reward *only* writing, with no recognition of the advantages of reading, of thinking, and of dialogue, discussion, and argument.

The problem, of course, is that the alternative to publishing has not always been creative teaching. Too often it has been instead mindless and monotonous course repetition, sometimes modified by frenzied involvement in trivial campus politics. Such activity — or inactivity — deadens both teacher and campus. I recall the chairman of one English department where I was offered a teaching position warning me that students arrived on his campus as very bright freshmen but had grown dumb by the time they became juniors. We, too, often arrive as very bright graduates only to grow dumb in our years of teaching. Preventing that disease of creeping boredom is the major challenge facing an administration which wishes to stimulate genuine faculty development.

In 1974 Trinity College received a $200,000 grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation which enabled the college to launch a three-year support program that met this challenge. During the academic years 1975-76, 1976-77, and 1977-78, Trinity used its Mellon money to fund two complementary programs, both of which had as their major aim the re-integration of teaching and scholarship on the Trinity campus. The first program, the more conventional, provided four individual research fellowships each year, offering summer stipends and partial course reductions as incentive to research. It was hoped that these grants would enable professors to pursue research while they were also preparing and teaching classes. The second program funded one interdisciplinary symposium each year. Each symposium consisted of five or six Trinity faculty members from different departments who wished to study and discuss together a specifically designated topic during one summer and one fall term. Each member of a symposium received a summer stipend and a two-thirds course reduction during the fall term.

In the summer and fall of 1976 I co-ordinated the second of these Mellon symposia. Our group contained five faculty members, one each from the departments of English, history, philosophy, psychology, and religion. We focused on nineteenth-century intellectual history, concentrating specifically on the evolving concepts of the individual in the nineteenth-century thought. Most importantly, however, ours was a search for the possibilities of wholeness and intellectual synthesis. Our goal, as we described it in our proposal, was to negate as far as possible the artificial boundaries separating our disciplines:

Psychology, philosophy, religion, literature, and history are all studied in our curriculum as separate and distinct disciplines. The intention of this symposium is to locate the sources of the separation in the culture of nineteenth century Europe . . . Through the interdisciplinary investigation of the Weltanschauung of nineteenth century European culture, we hope to learn more about how the disciplines in which we now find ourselves came about, how they understood themselves and their origins, what presuppositions and world-views they contained, and how they were influenced by and in turn influenced the other disciplines.

(quoted from symposium proposal, presented in 1976)

In pursuit of this goal we read our way through as many major thinkers of the nineteenth-century as a rigorous seven month schedule would allow. In addition to individual summer stipends and course load reductions, the College granted us a generous budget with which to purchase books and to bring well-known scholars in each of our fields to Trinity to lead two-day seminars and give public lectures. Thus, especially in the fall term, we were able to involve the campus as a whole in our activities.

Our summer work began with a four-week prefatory unit of study on Rousseau, Kant, and the French Revolution, directed by the philosopher and the historian. Under my guidance we then began the nineteenth century studies by discussing English and German Romantic poetry. Our first seven weeks concluded with the theologian directing a discussion of Friedrich Schleiermacher's *On Religion*. As the symposium developed, the psychologist slowly assumed a provocative skepticism about the humanistic bias of our inquiry which helped to provide the basis for heated discussion each Tuesday and Thursday afternoon from 1:00 until 5:30.

During the summer this pattern of reading intensively and meeting twice weekly for discussions was varied only once, when we spent three days together on retreat in Vermont. As the fall term began so did our public presentation to the campus. This included colloquia led by each of us as well as public seminars and lectures given by visiting scholars in our fields. Students and colleagues were also invited to our previously private bi-weekly seminars which continued throughout the term.

When the symposium ended in December, four of our group found that we were not prepared to surrender the fun of it all. Nothing in my academic career had approached those seven months of reading and playing productively with ideas. Economic and philosophical history had often crossed swords in highly beneficial ways; I had discovered parallels between the assumptions of poets and theologians of which I was previously unaware. And we were convinced of our initial thesis; that intellectual history should be taught primarily from an interdisciplinary perspective.

To give concrete, curricular shape to this conviction the historian, philosopher, theologian, and I began to work with one academic dean to

establish a curriculum for undergraduates at Trinity that would incorporate the best aspects of our shared experience. As a direct result, a slightly expanded group of professors offered the 1979 incoming freshmen at Trinity an experimental two-year curriculum entitled "Guided Studies in the Humanities." Approximately 28 carefully selected freshmen have agreed to give up from 40 to 60% of their free elective options for two (or, in a few cases, three) years to follow a carefully sequenced set of courses in philosophy, history, religion, literature, the history of science, and cultural anthropology. Basically designed as a broadly liberalizing course of study, compatible with every major in the college, this curriculum provides a grounding in Western European culture without in any way insisting on the primacy of that culture. We work with the Intercultural Studies program at Trinity to provide, as far as possible, an introduction to the terms and issues of comparative cultural study in the hopes of placing the cultural traditions of western Europe in perspective for our students.

The core of this program in its first year is a colloquium which integrates the three separate required courses. This three-hour weekly colloquium, a non-credit and unpaid overload for both students and teachers, is modeled in part on our symposium seminars and reflects our commitment to one of academia's most potent truisms: that students, like teachers, learn best when their separate course studies are brought into a joint focus.

The Guided Studies program represents only the first of the curricular fantasies which those of us in the original Mellon symposium on the nineteenth century hope to bring to fruition. We also envisioned a limited undergraduate major in modern intellectual history with an interdisciplinary focus. It took three years to plan and initiate Guided Studies as phase one of our design; we expect to give the same attention to phase two. Meanwhile, a renewed interest throughout the campus in interdisciplinary courses and team-taught seminars testifies to the influence on the entire Trinity campus of the three-year Mellon symposium program.

The symposia brought personal as well as curricular results. I can speak best about my own development. I came to Trinity trained as a medievalist with some interest in linguistics. I chose the small college atmosphere intentionally, in part because I am more comfortable within its enclosed community than in a larger university environment but also because of the chance to teach courses outside my specialty. Since the symposium in 1976, the central focus of both my teaching and my research has expanded to include the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Within the last two years I have taught four separate courses in nineteenth century literature and history: a drama course which began with Goethe and ended with Ibsen and Strindberg; a double credit team-taught senior seminar in European history and literature from 1870 to 1920, co-taught with a member of the history department; a survey course for 75 students in nineteenth century literature, music and art — the only course I have

taught at Trinity to which more than 35 students were admitted; and a graduate course in nineteenth century British literature and art.

My own scholarly work also reflects a similar extension of emphasis. I have given professional lectures and written articles on Wagner and Ibsen, on the phenomenon of Hitlerism as a dramatic spectacle in the nineteenth century mode, on Thomas Mann. And I foresee other such efforts. In a more complex way, my understanding of the nineteenth century has also modified my medieval studies. I have been investigating the influence on literature, particularly on late medieval drama, of sociological, theological, and political parallels between the family, the state, and the kingdom of God in fifteenth century England. Having that set of parallels in mind while teaching Rousseau, Blake, Emily Bronte, or Charles Dickens, I have perceived a new dimension to the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century idealization of the family which I had not previously suspected.

Where this perception will take me or what precise shape I may ultimately give this study I cannot yet say. However, already I have a much better sense of the historical process leading from the fifteenth to the nineteenth centuries, and I have been able to introduce provocative theses about the nature of the idealized Victorian family into my courses. In whatever other direction I may finally go with my pre-occupation with the family in literary history, it has already stimulated my students, enlivened my teaching, and reinforced my initial thesis regarding the fifteenth century.

I did not undertake the Mellon Symposium to produce scholarly lectures or articles. I wanted simply to know more about the nineteenth century and preferred to share that study with scholars whose major interests already centered at least in part on that century. Entering into a process of development with that idea in mind, I have discovered that the other activity, the "scholarly" achievement, has naturally followed of its own accord. In this case the two concepts of faculty development which I began by describing have merged into one. And along the way, other teachers, students, and the overall college curriculum have been affected by this one Mellon Symposium. No such result could have been obtained if the five of us had been given separate, individual research grants with instructions to publish fast. The chemistry of the symposium itself generated the process I have outlined, and I am convinced that it could not have happened otherwise.

In committing itself to faculty support programs after the termination of the Mellon grant, Trinity has chosen not to renew the symposium grants. We have elected to offer only research grants. Perhaps this decision is justified now. It may be that a college with 135 full time equivalent teaching positions could sustain only a few symposia of the kind funded by Mellon for three years. And, certainly, in a marketplace in which the small college teacher often cannot compete for fellowship money successfully against candidates from univer-

sities known as research centers, our teachers need all the assistance they can receive from a limited budget.

Nevertheless, as a member of the research committee that reluctantly made this decision, I voiced a dissenting regret. In a letter to the Mellon Foundation describing the benefits of the two Mellon programs at Trinity, the individual grants and the symposia, Trinity's President Theodore Lockwood gave a special nod to the symposia, indicating "that the impact of the symposia on the institution has been greater than that of the research fellowships." I obviously concur with President Lockwood. The symposium format seems to me to capitalize on the particular strengths of undergraduate campuses like ours: it does not require a research library, which we do not have; and it does thrive upon the closeness of interaction between departments and the communal atmosphere which small colleges foster and which larger universities can only envy.

Participating in the Mellon Symposium was an extraordinary experience for us at Trinity. The five outside scholars who visited our campus during our particular symposium all expressed a similar enthusiasm for this structure which made it possible for us to do throughout several months what most of us surely had in mind when we chose an academic career: to read, to argue, to come together with colleagues and students in free intellectual debate.

Faculty Exchange: Overcoming Academic Calcification

JOHN RODES

I have always thought the term "faculty development" sounded somewhat uncouth, but there is no doubt about the need for faculty "renewal" or "resuscitation." Given the present academic job market, college professors' mobility has been almost eliminated. Thus, the middle-aged Professor, having finally achieved tenure, looks forward to decades at the same institution, teaching the same or similar courses, lunching with the same colleagues, and serving on committees that frequently change labels and structure but basically rehash the same problems year after year.

To be sure, there are several ways to combat this soporific monotony. One can devise new courses or different approaches to similar material. One can get a grant to retool in some adjacent field, or take time off from teaching for a temporary deanship or other administrative position. A fortunate few can spend occasional time away from their campus or research grant; or, if in the right field, they can spice up their life and income with consulting assignments.

A different, relatively unexplored and neglected way to beat the syndrome of academic calcification is to enter into a faculty exchange. It is a means for "renewal" without sacrificing income or sabbatical time. Although one remains a teacher during an exchange, so much is bound to be different at the host institution that it is somewhat like starting a new career. A different city, a different environment, new colleagues, new procedures, a different type of student body. The differences tend to overshadow the unchanged fact that one is still the same college professor.

Teaching at another university on a temporary basis — I have done it some half dozen times by now, either as an exchangee or as a one-way guest professor — is always a highly rewarding experience. It encompasses many benefits for the professors involved as well as for both institutions.

Consider course offerings, for example. Conceivably, one could constantly change academic offerings at home, in order to escape stultifying repetition. But we all know that is hardly easy, usually impossible. Institutional demands,

---

John Rodes is Professor of History at Occidental College, Los Angeles, California.

student preferences, continuity in educational programs, library resources directed toward certain areas, conservatism on the curriculum committee or of those responsible for the catalog — all impede frequent change of courses.

On an exchange, however, it is easy, often necessary, to offer a different academic repertoire, either on one's own ititiative or at the request of the host institution. It requires new reading and research, rethinking problems, reorganizing materials,and guarantees a break in the normal monotony. For students at the host institution, the exchange often produces course offerings not usually available to them.

Then there is the additional time available for leisure and for what I would call "uninvolved participation." Host institutions usually do not require guest professors to serve on committees, participate in meetings, advise students, or undertake a myriad other normal professorial activities. Suddenly, it becomes clearly evident how many weekly hours are usually spent, and often wasted, on affairs beyond one's courses. Unexpectedly, there is time to read and write, and — as in the case of my last exchange with the University of Puget Sound — to explore the beautiful Northwest and British Columbia, Puget Sound, the San Juan Islands, the Olympic Mountains, Mount Rainer, and the rain forests.

On the other hand, most host institutions permit participation in their college affairs on a voluntary basis. How refreshing, often amusing, it is to sit in on occasional departmental meetings, or sessions of the Senate or Faculty. One can listen to petty bickering among colleagues or the prolongation of pointless controversy, even participate in discussion — all without personal involvement. How comforting to realize that one's problems are not unique. Then again, it can be reassuring to find out that one's own institution is not hopelessly behind, that others are proposing "new" ideas that had been enacted at home perhaps a decade earlier. Such detachment notwithstanding, there is also a thrill in hearing truly "new" ideas or the discussion of "new" procedures which one can take back and try to implement at home.

The student body, of course, is different and hence the interaction with students. At the University of Puget Sound, for instance, there were a great number from Hawaii, and few Chicanos and Blacks. There were also many older and married students, veterans or people who were completing their education after a number of years at work, often studying on a part-time basis. Their outlook on life of course varied from that of my usual Occidental freshmen. It called for new approaches.

Even more exciting than dealing with new types of students is meeting new colleagues, making new, often lasting, friendships, observing different life styles. Perhaps all colleges are ivory towers, but each college grows its distinct type of ivy; and it is refreshing to breathe a different air — especially when one normally lives in Los Angeles.

From the financial point of view, faculty exchanges should cause no hardship. It is best to remain contractually and financially completely attached to the

home institution, including medical, retirement, sabbatical, and other fringe benefits. A year elsewhere should be counted as a year of teaching at home also in regard to promotion or advancement. Of course, it is often necessary to receive additional aid — normally from a foundation or a special faculty development fund — to help with costs of travel and moving and to compensate for possibly high cost of living differentials.

Besides rejuvenating the professors involved, exchanges also benefit both institutions. The exchangee learns new ideas, procedures, teaching methods which may be adapted to the needs of the home institution. Conversely, one can occasionally offer useful suggestions to the host institution. More important, perhaps, by serving elsewhere, one gains perspective on the advantages and shortcomings of the home institution. Upon returning, I tend to discuss such observations with my colleagues. The result, in my experience, has usually been a positive morale builder.

Finally, an exchange adds to one's knowledge of the academic world more than reading a dozen education journals. One feels more and more at home in academe.

If exchanges are so beneficial, why are they so rare and so hard to arrange? For one, many deans don't like them. Exchanges, they assert, disrupt the normal flow of academic life. What will the majors in your department do about the courses they planned to take from you, if you leave for a year? Who will chair your committee, or your department? How do we know the person they send us to replace you is any good? I have heard a phethora of such objections and seen many obstacles placed in the path of faculty trying to arrange exchanges.

Even when institutional arrangements are easily made and deans are supportive, there is a need for enlightened colleagues. Visiting professors, like any new department member, never carry their full share of the departmental load. The many tasks that must be performed inevitably fall on fewer shoulders — an often annoying burden in a small department. Hence, prerequisites for setting up smooth exchanges are cooperative and understanding colleagues.

However, what makes arranging exchanges above all so difficult are the personal preferences, habits, and obligations of faculty members themselves. A spouse with a job or other commitments that cannot be even temporarily suspended! Children in school, adamant against interrupting their educational routine and leaving their circle of friends! A research project that requires local resources, or a publication deadline that might be hard to meet with the disruption of a move! Beyond that lurks a basketful of ingrained habits and personal predilections. "After eighteen years in this place, where everyone knows me, I am reluctant to plunge into a totally new set-up." "My family and I would not have any friends there." "The thought of renting my home for a year, packing, finding a new place . . .; it's not worth it!" "All our new plants

might die while we are gone." "What about the cats?" "Making all those arrangements, it just seems too complicated."

There seems no end to the type of excuses I have encountered, rationalizations for rejecting an offer of exchange. Actually, outright rejections are rare. The common reply when I suggest an exchange is: "Not now, but ask me again sometime in the future!"

It is clear, of course, that in most of these cases academic inertia has already set in — the very symptoms or disease which a faculty exchange is designed to alleviate or cure. For, in fact, exchanges are not difficult to arrange. A little spirit of enterprise and adventure can usually solve most problems that seem at first so awesome. And the experience — as well as the memories — more than compensate for the slight inconveniences that may be encountered.

Developing a New Point of View

ROBERT V. SMITH

For certain types of faculty, development grants can be especially important. The first type is the young unestablished scholar-teacher who needs a fairly sizeable grant to start that next project after the dissertation has been mined for publishable material. Such grants are hard to find.

However, faculty in another category have even greater difficulty getting grants. These are the over-the-college-hill-gang (past 50) and still without reputation as publishing scholars. Foundations and other granting agencies seem to think that someone on the slide downhill toward retirement cannot be rescued from his continuing candidacy for oblivion, whether that oblivion was self-created or the result of other factors such as ill-chosen research directions or the many false starts demanded by working in an area of conceptual complexity. If a college wants to rescue this "deadwood," especially those who have found sufficient personal satisfaction from their work as teachers, then one way of encouraging them to further scholarship is through such grants.

Another target for faculty development grants is the intellectual coward. Some persons find it difficult to try out the ideas they have on the wider intellectual community because they fear they will appear stupid, unscholarly and inadequate in some way. This problem is of special importance in interdisciplinary work for there is always one more source one should have consulted, one more development underway of which one is not aware, and one more place to consult in any multidisciplinary work. It takes a lot of confidence — in philosophy and religion some might say arrogance — to think one can find something new under the sun or that one can say it better than all others have said it.

These reflections lead me to two conclusions: 1. Faculty development grants can and should be used for a number of different purposes. While my own grant has not yet increased my publications (although it may), other important things have happened. 2. Many non-academic reasons should be considered in such awards, especially the effect in building or bolstering sufficient confidence to create a contributing scholar or to stimulate and recreate one that has fallen fallow.

Robert V. Smith is Professor of Philosophy and Religion at Colgate University, Hamilton, New York.

My own case might be an example of the older faculty person who has overtones of intellectual cowardice and for whom the faculty development grant has yet to have tangible publishable results. But the conclusion should not be reached that its award was not extremely productive for me and, I hope, for my students. More than anything else it motivated me to get back to work on a project I had been nibbling away at for some time, and in the process I was forced to expand the horizons of what I was thinking and doing. The project was an attempt to systematize and express some ideas about language, and especially the meaning of religious/theological language under the general title "A Contextual Analysis of Religious/Theological Language." As I had worked away at this task, it became clear that the culture in general and the religious setting in particular were of critical importance to the meaning of utterances within religious/theological contexts. This clearly suggested the need for cross-cultural considerations.

A further motivation for me to seek a faculty development grant came directly from curricular needs. The department in which I work had no courses that dealt with Black Theology or with the Black Church in any depth. For many of our incoming minority students very little existed in the curriculum of our clearly white upper class liberal arts college which resonated with their experience. The University offers a series of Freshman Seminars in which faculty members pursue topics of their own choosing with a group of students who have chosen or been assigned to that seminar. Through this process of joint teaching, study, and research it is hoped that entering students will discover what is involved in being a better student for four years. In the work of this seminar — especially from minority students drawing on their own experiences and insight — I became acutely aware of the immense contribution culture made to the meaning of a simple sentence and particularly to the meaning of religious/theological utterances. This was significant because that difference was within what was seemingly a single culture — that of the United States — yet still very distinct and quite pronounced.

From these experiences and others emerged the need to look carefully with an empirical methodology at the meaning of religious/theological language within a cross-cultural context. The work I was engaged in at the time indicated the same thing, but the possibility of doing a cross-cultural study (modest at best) never occurred to me until I became aware that funds were available through a faculty development program at our University.

Under the University's regular sabbatical program time was available, but not the necessary funds to leave this country, spend time in preparation at the London School of Oriental and African Studies, and travel to various places where the work would be done and to speak with informants in their situation. A modest grant under the enlarged faculty development program at Colgate made all this possible, along with the generosity of a variety of individuals and institutions that I had come to know over the years. The result was a series of

interviews, visits and observations in eight different places in three countries of Africa, one place in India and one in Japan. The latter two places were to serve as bench marks rather than provide new information, since the church has been present in each of these countries somewhat longer than it has been in Africa.

Personal testimony as to the meaning of this experience has to proceed at two levels. One task is the technical analysis and presentation of the data. The data gathered consist of about thirty hours of taped conversations and question-answer sessions recorded in Ghana, Nigeria, Kenya, India and Japan. The analysis of these data has gone forward very slowly due to several personal events. The result is that the data are only now — 1½ year later — being analyzed in a preliminary way.

The other level of this experience — impressionistic and unsystematic — has already had considerable impact on courses. The first and most obvious aspect has been the use of some of the experiences of the trip as illustrative material in lectures. I teach a course titled "Introduction to Religion" in which there is a section on liturgy and worship. It is quite natural to make references to the things I saw and heard in the wide variety of worship services I visited during the trip. I usually make special reference to the services in which I participated during a three day visit to the Annual Conference of the Musama Disco Christo church in Mozana, Ghana, one of the many new indigenous Independent African Christian Churches.

The larger conclusions from a systematic analysis of the material cannot be shared at this time, but I can confidently communicate much that enriches our classroom discussions of liturgy and worship. I am also able to highlight for my students the most pressing religious concern of many African Christians and many African Christian Churches. How much or how little of African culture and traditional ways of life and spiritual activity is going to be continued into the modern world? What will the difference be between the "main-line" churches and the rapidly developing indigenous African Christian churches that are appearing faster than they can be counted?

A second aspect at the impressionistic level has been a greater awareness of religious pluralism, another topic considered in the course mentioned above. Awareness of this issue is expected of any student of religious phenomena in our time, but conversations and discussions with learned and devout Hindus and Indian Christians in Madras at Akahiah Alayam Ashram, and the keen insights and guidance of Father Ignatius Hiruddayam, S.J., brought my consciousness of it into far sharper focus. One of the most important conversations I had was with an Indian Christian who, although now over 70 (a convert at 20), was still seeking to find ways in which the faith he now professed related to and was enriched and modified by the culture which was also his. Anyone familiar with some of the analyses of "cultural Christianity" will see, I think, the useful and helpful parallel. How much this particular experience has affected my

teaching is hard to say, but I make frequent references to it as illustrative material.

But there has been a more basic area of change in my general approach to the way I do Philosophy of Religion — a senior seminar especially for majors. In trying to understand what I saw happening for African, Indian and to a much lesser degree Japanese theological students, I became acutely aware that the habits of strict categorization into which I had fallen made little contribution to that understanding. The experience revived a much earlier concern for describing processes and interactions rather than analyzing moments, words and concepts. The effort to be clear and precise as a teacher so that students would call the course well-organized, assignments clear, and feel they got good notes had become a siren song, because it continued the illusion of being a good teacher. The fuzzy indefinite, the in-process part of what one experiences, thinks, feels and tries to communicate gets omitted so that the difficult, although important, and not very clear, but exciting ideas, never get mentioned. This has led to much more concern for the context of religious thought, for the process of religious utterance and thinking, and for the culture in which the philosophical problem or contribution originated. It was central, or so it seemed, after this experience, to the study of the meaning of religious/theological language — the substantive content of the philosophy of religion — to consider these matters rather than others. Categorizing, defining, arguing and clearly demonstrating became less important because the experience outlined above made me aware that the application of those aspects of method did not deal satisfactorily with religious/theological utterance.

As a result of the development grant I have made every effort to modify my teaching and my methods in the way indicated. However, this did not mean that I became merely impressionistic or purely poetic, but I began to look at any utterance in the broadest possible setting and consider arguments and evidence in the widest context rather than in the narrowest one which seems to be what much analytical philosophy of religion is interested in doing. In the final analysis, for me the most important result of my development grant was to qualify my certainties with tentativity, my judgments of truth with openness to other possibilities, and to make me work harder at continuities rather than distinctions.

My faculty development grant, therefore, had three facets in ascending order of importance. The first is that the content or material with which I dealt built on something already under consideration. This was important because most such grants cannot be large enough to initiate and also conclude a project. The second facet is that my project forced me to consider not just the content of my thinking but also the methodology I was using to communicate the development of my thinking to students. I am certain that faculty development must be related to students and not just to the faculty person's interests. If it is true that good teaching will remain good only so long as its practitioners continue to do

research, especially publishable research, then a corollary could be true that good research is important only so long as its value is communicated to some audience through classroom, publication, addresses, newspaper reports or whatever form one may be able to obtain. But the final facet and the most important aspect of faculty development for me is not just the impact on content or communication, but on the attitudes and dispositions one brings to the work being done. Freed from regular duties, one should find in faculty development grants an extended opportunity to rethink the whole scope of one's point of view and to reevaluate what one has been doing and should be doing. I did and I'm grateful.

Learning With A Colleague

JAMES RANSOM

In the autumn of 1975, Haverford College received a grant for faculty enrichment from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. The college had addressed its proposal for this grant to the question of how to ensure the continuing vitality of a teaching faculty that is heavily tenured, relatively young, and unlikely to grow in size over the next two decades. The express concern of the proposal was that the undergraduate education offered by this faculty remain liberal and humanizing in an era when professionalism and departmentalization threaten to result in an increasingly narrow curriculum. The proposal sought to promote faculty growth and development, particularly along cross-departmental and interdisciplinary lines, with special emphasis on teaching capabilities as well as individual scholarly development. Pursuant to this goal, the proposal sought funds for released time for team teaching, taking the course of a colleague in a field outside one's own department, and new skill leaves ("the opportunity to develop teaching competence in areas which, while related to past work, nevertheless take the faculty member into new fields").

When the college announced the reception of this grant and invited proposals from the faculty, my colleague from the Political Science department, Sara Shumer, and I (I'm in the English department) decided to submit a joint proposal addressing all three of the purposes for which funding had been granted. We had been aware for some time of certain areas of interrelatedness in one another's scholarship and teaching. Ms. Shumer is in American political theory; I'm in American literature. We had shared many of the same students during a decade of teaching at the college. We were always running into one another in the same area of the stacks or at the same lectures; and, on occasion, we had discussed one another's scholarship at lunch or over coffee. The Mellon grant seemed to offer the opportunity we had been waiting for to pursue these interrelations to some significant depth. Hence, we submitted coordinate proposals, asking that I be given released time to take her course in American Political Theory in the fall semester, 1976-77; that she take my course in the Literature of The New Republic, 1820-1855, in the spring semester, 1976-77; and that the two of us develop an interdisciplinary course in political thought

---

James Ransom is Associate Professor of English, Haverford College, Haverford, Pennsylvania.

and literary expression in America before the Civil War, to be team-taught in the spring semester, 1977-78. Our proposals were accepted and we carried out our plan exactly as proposed.

Looking back upon this project with an eye to its effectiveness in promoting my own development as a scholar and teacher, I see three distinct though interrelated aspects, corresponding to the three main steps in our proposal. In brief, these are the experiences of taking a colleagues course, having a colleague take one of my courses, and developing and team-teaching an interdisciplinary course with a colleague from a department other than my own. Let me first consider each of these experiences separately and then briefly address the overall effectiveness of our experiment in faculty development.

It was great fun to be a student again, especially since Ms. Shumer and I agreed that, while regular, fully prepared attendance at classes would be *de rigueur*, I would not have to take exams or do the term paper required of the undergraduates of the class. Despite the absence of such propaedeutics, I learned a great deal about American political theory from Ms. Shumer and about the methods of analysis her discipline could bring to historical texts, enough that I found myself challenging some of her conclusions. She didn't agree with my arguments, and the result has been an ongoing debate that has come to focus on fundamental theoretical and methodological questions with respect both to the interpretation of historical texts and the uses of such texts in historical inquiry. At least, that's the way I see it; my colleague probably sees it in somewhat different terms. All of which goes to say that the first and most obvious contribution to my own development as a scholar resulting from my taking this colleagues's course was to lead me deeper and more comprehendingly into the heart of my own discipline, literary history. I will have more to say about specific contributions to my scholarship resulting from our collaboration, but first I want to say something about the effect of taking Ms. Shumer's course on my own teaching. From the perspective of faculty development in a liberal arts college, this may well be the most important benefit to be derived from such a program.

First of all, I have to say that Ms. Shummer is a gifted teacher. Students here at the college have always regarded her as one of the best teachers on our faculty. Colleagues in the faculty have always found in her the qualities of articulate intelligence and disciplined energy that have led us to believe that, at least this time, the students know what they are talking about. What I, as a teacher, learned from taking her course is that great teaching is not all inspired genius and innate talent, however much these intangibles might count. If poets are made not born, so too are teachers. Which is to say, Ms. Shumer is a master of her craft. It's always good to learn from a master craftsman.

What did I learn from her teaching? I learned to listen very carefully to my students. I learned to listen in order to find out what they know. Only then will I know what I might do to help them expand the horizons of their knowledge. So,

I learned to start with questions not answers; to listen. I learned that this kind of listening is not passive, but involves the teacher in helping the students to recognize the form or structure of their own observations. For this, Ms. Shumer used the blackboard very effectively, jotting down key words and elaborating an outline of the discussion. Thus, I learned a technique for keeping a class discussion focused on key terms and providing a clear structure within which coherent discourse could develop.

What this technique provides for the teacher is a structure within which to instruct the students in the vocabulary and methodology of one's discipline. Terminology may be introduced and defined in answer to needs arising from the student's own efforts to follow out lines of inquiry in pursuit of understanding the implications of, for example, a given text. Theoretical hypotheses or methods of analysis may be suggested as means of attempting to resolve disagreements or to see beyond apparent dead-ends. It is also true that when they discover that the teacher is listening to them and that, as a matter of course, they are expected to have something to say, students begin to show up for class having read and thought about the text to a much greater extent than is usually the case in a class where students come expecting to hear what the teacher thinks about the reading.

When it became my turn to be the teacher and my colleague's to be the student, the learning process continued for me. It was one thing to know that I ought to listen to my students and yet another actually to learn to listen well. Having Ms. Shumer in class helped. She insisted on being heard and always let me know when I had stopped listening and started merely imposing my own ideas on my captive audience. I have to admit that I sometimes found it hard to take, but in the long run I did learn to listen. As a result, my teaching improved. I found my students making observations and articulating readings that went far beyond the expectations I had come to have about the capabilities of undergraduates. I actually started looking forward to going to class, not anxious about whether or not I could get through to the students, but eager to find out where our class discussions would lead. I found my class pursuing questions about the interpretation of the assigned poems and stories and novels central to the concerns of literary criticism, and in a context of historical, political, moral, and metaphysical concern generated by the various individual interests of those in the class. I remember this course as one of the best I have taught. It must also be admitted that knowing my colleague would be there every time was a great antidote to procrastination when it came to my own preparations for class.

From the point of view of faculty enrichment, the team-taught course that resulted from the experience of taking one another's course involved two separate experiences. First, there was the experience of planning the course. While the result was simple enough (we set up a reading list that combined readings from our two departmental courses, all relevant to a set of concerns that included a conflict between individualism and communal values, the

search for a public voice and rhetoric suitable to a democratic order, and the problem of continuity and discontinuity in the American society; and we agreed to share responsibility for leading class discussions according to whose original reading list had contained the book to be discussed at a given class meeting), the conservations that led to this result involved both of us in a process of sharpening our respective theories of reading and theses concerning the structure of American society and its cultural artifacts. This sharpening has helped both of us in our individual scholarly projects, making a direct contribution to actual writing projects in which each of us is engaged.

After the planning stage came the course itself. This was clearly more than merely Ms. Shumer's political science course plus Ransom's literature course, and offered our students not only an opportunity to read a variety of texts from this historical period (letters, journalistic articles, editorials, debates, essays, poems, stories, and novels) but also led them to ponder fundamental theoretical and methodological problems with respect both to the interpretation of the text and the nature of historical inquiry. We plan to continue teaching the course on a bi-annual basis. From the viewpoint of the college's original concern, this course clearly represents a substantial contribution to the goal of vital teaching in the tradition of liberal education. None of the rigor of our respective departmental courses has been sacrificed and yet the course leads the students well beyond the confines, however narrow, of either literary criticism or political theory.

Overall, I find that this experiment succeeded in promoting my personal development as a scholar and a teacher. I am a better teacher because of what I learned from my colleague. As I have presented it, this is much more than a question of my having acquired another frame of reference for the books I teach, though undeniably what I have learned about American political theory does enrich my teaching. Beyond this, however, I have acquired skills as a teacher that transcend any particular subject matter or academic discipline. I am also a better scholar, having been led to a deeper understanding of the theory and practice of my own discipline through the challenge of having to articulate that theory and practice to a colleague outside my discipline. It is also true that the interaction I have had with this colleague has stimulated my own research in quite specific ways. I am currently at work on a project relating the rhetoric of American poetry in the late 18th century to the context of political thought and debate during the Revolutionary period. In sum, our experiment indicates that colleagues from different departments, if given the appropriate structure in which to work together, have a lot to learn from one another, and this learning can result in enriching the teaching and scholarship of the individuals involved.

Old Dog, New Tricks

ROBERT MENEFEE

"You have spoken of your increasing interest in history," said the Dean. "How would you feel about teaching in the Religious and Historical Perspectives course?"

That may sound like a fairly routine discussion between a college dean and a college professor. Professors do undertake new teaching assignments from time to time, and deans do have to staff interdisciplinary courses. In the spring of 1976, however, that was for me a VERY HEAVY question! It was loaded with three important and different kinds of freight: the nature of that particular course, the nature of my professional background, and the nature of the faculty development resources available to the Dean.

First, the course. Religious and Historical Perspectives is one of three interdisciplinary courses designed by the staff of Berea College and required for all its students. The other two (Issues and Values, Man and the Arts) are freshman requirements. "RHP," taken in the sophomore year, continues the composition emphasis of the first two and presents a history of ideas as its content. By vote of the faculty, the first objective of Religious and Historical Perspectives is:

> "to explore through the writings of significant thinkers the historical development of critical ideas and themes which have animated western culture . . ."

In the line of curricular evolution at Berea, progenitors of this course include History of Western Civilization, Old Testament, and New Testament, but it differs in important ways from each of those.

Spurred by the Dean's question, I borrowed a copy of the "RHP *Handbook*" to find out just which "significant thinkers" the course explored. In the fall term they include Hesiod, Sophocles, Marcus Aurelius, Moses, Jeremiah, Jesus, Paul, Augustine, Dante. No wonder the Sophomores are almost too tired to go home for Christmas! In the spring term come Machiavelli, Luther, Shakespeare, Galileo, Swift, Dickens, Marx, Darwin, Freud. One might not have to know everything to teach the course, I decided, but it surely would help!

Robert Menefee is Professor of Economics and Business at Berea College, Berea, Kentucky.

During its five years of existence, Religious and Historical Perspectives had been taught by a first-rate staff drawn from Philosophy, History, Classics, English Literature, and Religion. Which brings me to a second "heavy" question: What about my professional background? I grew up in *Economics*, of all things! Can an Economist ever find true happiness with the likes of Marcus Aurelius, Saint Augustine, Jonathan Swift, and Charles Darwin? The Dean — also an Economist — had been the one to bring up this whole idea. What was his trouble? (Cracked under the pressures of administration, maybe? Not likely.) He was strong on faculty development, I knew. But to get an acceptable teacher of Religious and Historical Perspectives from a professor of Economics seemed, as I first looked at the course, more an act of creation than of development!

Gradually, however, some other facets of my professional background and educational philosophy came to mind. Never had a narrow, technical version of Economics held any attraction — my intellectual affiliations were with Institutional Economics and Political Economy. For twenty years I had taught in an earlier interdisciplinary requirement, Introduction to Social Science. My concern had always been MAN (including WOMAN), *not* "economic man." While the R. and H.P. *Handbook* listed some "significant thinkers" of whom I knew little, there were others with whom I was reasonably well acquainted and three old friends in Machiavelli, Locke, and Marx. The Spring Term theme of "Revolution" was one with which I would surely be comfortable.

Besides, hadn't I always carried a spear for breadth and liberal education and interdisciplinary courses when the faculty staged their periodic tournaments to decide what the learners should learn? Perhaps it was time for me to climb off my horse, shuck my armor, and do some digging. If, as a faculty, we expect college sophomores to learn how to tell a HEsiod from a SHEsiod, I *should* be capable of mastering it.

My thinking began to sprout small patches of confidence. Now, what was that third kind of freight which made the Dean's question so HEAVY? First, the course. Second, my background. Third, the development resources available to the Dean and, through him, to faculty. In the spring of 1976, my wife and I were making plans for a 1976-77 sabbatical leave. The Berea College policy on sabbaticals provides full pay for a *half* year or *two-thirds* pay for a full year. From experience, I knew that the value of a year's leave is *more* than twice that of a half-year's, and College policy invests substantially more in the full year. But two-thirds pay would require that I seriously compromise one of my deepest commitments — regular eating. That would be especially true if my wife and I carried through on our determination to include foreign study or travel in our plans.

So, back to the Dean. His faculty development resources include Mellon Fund grants made specifically to support study outside one's own discipline. He was prepared to offer a one-term grant of full salary plus an extra-living-

expense supplement for that term of study. Combined with sabbatical pay available during the second term, this would enable me and mine to keep victuals on the table all year. The quid pro quo involved my teaching Religious and Historical Perspectives for a period of not less than three years. The College was prepared to invest a sum equal to half my annual salary (plus basic maintenance for one) during four months. On my side, I would invest one term for study and a third of my teaching time for at least three years, almost certainly longer. Clearly, it was *not* the way to go simply as a means of achieving four months' income.

But IF the prospect of that study and learning and teaching appealed and excited, then here was a tremendous opportunity. The Greek classics, the Old Testament prophets, Dante's "Inferno," the Reformation, "Hamlet," Charles Dickens, Sigmund Freud — what college professor has not sighed wistfully for time to mine such gold and then turned dutifully to preparing next week's lectures? As a teacher of R. and H.P., these would become my "duty."

I decided. In went my application, back came approval, and things moved quickly. Working with the coordinator of the course, I constructed a list of topics and an extensive bibliography. My most extreme developmental needs were for systematic study in the history and literature of the Greeks and a modern, scholarly introduction to study of the Old Testament. I selected Vanderbilt University for its strength in those areas and for the quality of its library. Dean Jacque Voegeli extended me Visiting Scholar status, the Library assigned me a carrel, Professors Drew (Classics) and Crenshaw (Religion) welcomed me into their classes. I was able to extend the four months to six and managed to include substantial reading in Economics. The primary focus, however, remained upon preparation for teaching Religious and Historical Perspectives. In the summer of 1977 my wife and I, again with help from Berea College, spent six weeks in Athens, Rome, Florence, and London.

What did Berea College and I get for our rather substantial investment in my development? Quite a lot, I think, but first I want to recognize two things which did *not* happen. Obviously, I did not become an expert on Classical Greece or Old Testament or the intellectual history of Western civilization. Such experts can only be grown over many years, they cannot be "developed" in a season. It is equally obvious to my students that I did not suddenly become a dramatic classroom-personality firing listeners with a passion to understand the immortal ideas of mortal thinkers. I returned from my sabbatical leave no less pedestrian than a year earlier.

Perhaps, in fact, the College's funds could have been better spent if used to develop someone else. That is not for me to decide and, happily, it is now a moot question.

So, what *did* happen? From my point of view, the single most important benefit from study and travel was courage. Yes, *courage!* Notwithstanding thirty years of teaching, I approach each new school year, and especially each

new course, with considerable fear and trembling. That was magnified many times over as I reflected upon the prospect of an economist's leading a discussion of "Antigone" or expounding on Israel's exodus from Egypt. Only after a year's leave, six months' study and six weeks' travel could I possibly muster the courage — audacity, some would say — to enter that classroom.

Insofar as my courage has justification, it derived principally from the history I had been able to learn and the greater sense of history I had developed. It is knowing the history which provides context and meaning for events, persons, writings, beliefs. It is a sense of history which enables one to relate Greek polis to modern metropolis or ancient exodus to contemporary refugee. Vanderbilt's Professors Drew and Crenshaw go often to class with me, unseen and unheralded except as I pay them silent homage.

Along with the "vertical" benefit in the form of historical depth, there came also exciting "horizontal" benefits from being completely outside my field. This horizontal dimension might better be described as the interdisciplinary experience. And it was "inter," i.e., *two*-way not just one-way. Delving into philosophy, religion, and literature turned up new perspectives on the concepts and issues of Economics. At the same time, I often found meanings and insights because of my training in Economics which I would not otherwise have seen. Or, so I believe.

Let me illustrate. My departmental teaching includes a course in Monetary Economics which deals with the nature of money, its role in a modern economy, and an analysis of the institutions and the economic theory of monetary policy. As might be expected, current problems and applications focus on inflation. Though the economics of inflation — with "economics" narrowly defined — must take center stage, it is also important that inflation be understood as a process which redistributes income and wealth. Thus, inflation is a problem in social justice at the same time that it is a problem in Federal Reserve policy. Having arrived at that point, I perceive linkages with "Works and Days" by Hesiod, or with the denunciation of Israel by the prophet Amos, as well as with the modern writings of a Dickens or a Marx.

In short, some of what we say should be achieved by interdisciplinary approaches happened to me. It happened during my year of leave and has continued with the more intensive learning we call teaching. Lest some hapless reader be misled, I should add: I have also experienced the perils of interdisciplinary study and teaching. Dilettantism *is* a danger, to some degree it is unavoidable. I can never be proficient in all those fields. Ignorance, confusion, lack of integration sail with you when you steer into unknown seas. But, for me, the excitement of broadening and deepening, of learning with the students, of seeing my own field on a large canvass make it worth the risk. I am grateful for the opportunity.

Which brings me to one final benefit I see from my year of study and travel. When the College made that investment along with others like it before and

since, there was concrete evidence — a clear signal to staff and students — that the commitments to interdisciplinary education and to faculty development are real. Without resources behind them, statements in faculty meeting become empty rhetoric. It seems clear that in college budgeting: "Where your heart is, there will your treasures be also."

PART IV

Assessment of Current Effectiveness and Future Needs In Faculty Development

Empirical Findings on Faculty Development Programs

MICHAEL E. SIEGEL

Introduction

Our project sought to assess the impact of faculty development grants to twenty leading liberal arts colleges throughout the nation. Accordingly, visits were made to the twenty colleges, and extensive interviews were conducted with faculty, administrators, and, in some cases, students. At each college, two interviewers recorded independent judgments about the grant and its impact, and then a team report was hammered out, incorporating the opinions of each interviewer. In almost all cases the independent ratings of the interviewers were remarkably close.

Two kinds of data are presented below. First, what projects were tried? How can they be categorized? And which ones were most successful? Secondly, why were some projects or approaches to faculty development more successful than others? What seemed to be the key factors for success?

Categories and Success Rates of Projects

Based on a survey of the literature (Lindquist, 1979; Bergquist and Phillips, 1975; Gaff, 1975), and on our own field visits, we divided faculty development into four categories: professional development, instructional development, curricular change, and organizational development. Each category includes specific kinds of activities:

Professional Development includes conventional faculty development activities, such as individual study and research projects, attendance at professional meetings, and consulting with business or government officials. There were also some new approaches to professional development, such as taking courses outside one's original discipline, writing long-term growth plans, taking study leaves for the development of new skills, taking a colleague's course on campus, and participating in interdisciplinary course development.

Instructional Development includes activities designed specifically for the improvement of teaching or teaching-related activities. This is a somewhat new aspect of faculty development, spawned in part by the turmoil of the 1960's. Projects in this category included summer workshops devoted to discussing

pedagogy, workshops for the development of specific pedagogical skills (audio-visual aids, leading discussions, etc.), interdisciplinary course development, and the appointment of on-campus teaching consultants.

Curricular Change includes projects to institute new core courses, to evaluate departmental strengths and weaknesses, to explore the relevance of course offerings to careers, to revitalize a disciplinary major, and to invite visiting scholars.

Organizational Development involves projects to introduce relatively fundamental changes on the campus designed to enhance opportunities for faculty development. For example, an organizational change might involve setting up a new faculty evaluation system or streamlining the committee structure, or devising new general education requirements.

In addition to the different categories of faculty development, we noted the different *levels* on which activities occur. Typically, faculty development is perceived as an *individual* pursuit, the personal growth of a certain faculty member as a teacher, scholar, or productive member of the institution. It is important to indicate, however, that faculty development can also be a *group* or corporate process, whereby the faculty grows collectively and congeals as an intellectual community. Finally, faculty development may be pursued on an *institutional* level, whereby the entire institution evolves in new ways and meets new demands and develops new programs.

Frequencies and success of projects we encountered are reported below by category:

Professional Growth was, as expected, the most frequently used approach to faculty development. Nineteen out of twenty colleges (95 percent) had projects in this area.

In all there were 26 *recorded* projects. As indicated in Table I, a very high percentage of the projects in this category were rated as highly successful by the interviewers. Moreover, projects in this category were successful at both the individual and group levels.

TABLE I

Achievement Levels of Faculty Development Projects by Individual and Group and Institution Levels: Professional Growth

		Highly Successful	*Partly Successful*	*Unsuccessful*
Professional Growth				
Individual	(16)	12 (75%)	4 (25%)	0
Group	(8)	5 (75%)	2 (25%)	0
Institutional	(2)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0

That professional growth activities were successful is encouraging, since faculty members define themselves largely in professional terms, and since their real loyalty is frequently to a discipline. Our sense is also that faculty projects in professional growth often eventuate in improvements in faculty teaching, or at least in their enthusiasm for teaching. Thus, the faculty, students, and the institution all benefit from the professional development of faculty.

On the other hand, professional development is limited in its impact, since it usually occurs at the individual faculty level and tends to strengthen his or her disciplinary commitment, thereby compartmentalizing the curriculum and isolating faculty from one another. Professional development also fails to address seriously the issues involved in revising curricula and teaching techniques to meet the changing needs and competencies of students.

Turning to *Instructional Development* we find a different picture. Thirteen colleges (65 percent) had projects in this area. Eighteen different projects were identified. As indicated in Table 2, the success rate for projects in instructional development was considerably lower than that for professional development.

TABLE 2

Achievement Levels of Faculty Development Projects by Individual Group and Institutional Levels: Instructional Development

		Highly Successful	*Partly Successful*	*Unsuccessful*
Instructional Development				
Individual	(8)	2 (25%)	2 (37.5%)	3 (37.5%)
Group	(8)	1 (12.5%)	4 (50%)	3 (37.5%)
Institutional	(2)	—	2 (100%)	—

We note that a very small number of instructional development projects on any level were condidered highly successful. This stems from the basic difficulty with teaching improvement programs and is borne out by other surveys as well (Gaff, 1978). Faculty tend to suspect workshops organized around themes such as "Improving Teaching" or "Alternative Teaching Methods," since they doubt the rigor involved in such workshops and automatically become defensive about their own pedagogical techniques. As well, instructional developers frequently advertise the advantages of the *program* or *method*, and neglect the *people* and *processes* involved in dissemination efforts. There is a human tendency to oversell innovation and to promise more than one can possibly deliver.

On the other hand, we also note that selected projects in instructional development, particularly those which focus on group or corporate activities,

were highly successful. The elements for success, about which more will be said later, seem to be tied to the specificity of projects; that is, group teaching projects organized around a specific, pragmatically oriented theme — such as "the improvement of writing skills," or "how to use the computer in teaching" — were highly successful. In addition to directing faculty effort toward the development of new skills, these projects had the added impact of encouraging faculty intellectual exchange and interaction across disciplinary or departmental lines.

Our third category is *Curricular Change*. Here we counted 15 colleges (75 percent) that had projects, with a total of 19 distinct projects. Our data indicate a higher success rate in this area than in the area of instructional development, but not quite as high as in professional growth.

TABLE 3

Achievement Levels of Faculty Development Projects by Individual, Group, and Institutional Levels: Curricular Change

		Highly Successful	*Partly Successful*	*Unsuccessful*
Curricular Change				
Individual	(8)	4 (50%)	2 (25%)	2 (25%)
Group	(10)	5 (50%)	3 (30%)	2 (20%)
Institutional	(1)	—	—	1

Again, curricular change is an area where faculty feel more comfortable, and perhaps even more competent than they do in instructional development. Disciplinary considerations often prevail in discussion and decisions about the curriculum, and faculty participate as "experts" in molding departmental requirements or adding new courses or debunking obsolete courses.

On the other hand, we also found that by addressing issues of curricular concern, faculty were led inadvertantly to a consideration of teaching techniques and innovations; that is, in asking the question about "what" to teach, faculty frequently asked the ancillary question, "how" to teach. As well, curricular discussions provided an excellent format for the free exchange of ideas among faculty in different disciplines. This was especially true when projects were organized precisely to design interdisciplinary courses. Several of these were highly successful, both in terms of gaining popularity with students and in bringing faculty together.

Finally, we found only six colleges even attempting *Organizational Development*. This is not surprising, given the extreme difficulty inherent in such a complex and pervasive process as institutional change. Yet we found many faculty expressing the belief that if faculty development programs are really to

succeed on their campuses the institutional framework must be made more supportive. Reward structures, they said, must be altered to facilitate faculty willingness to experiment with new approaches and explore new ideas in teaching or research. Departments, we were told, must relinquish some of their "hold" over faculty commitments and priorities. And some told us that entire faculties must address squarely the issue of reshaping the curriculum, adding general education requirements or starting a "values" oriented course. We found, in fact, that faculty development activities achieve their greatest success when they are related, somehow, to institutional mission, and when they palpably influence the achievement of that mission (Chait, 1979).

Two specific facets of faculty development were conspicuous in their absence. First, very few of the colleges we visited were undertaking assessments of their faculty evaluation procedures or improvements. On 15 campuses (75 percent of sample), in fact, we found no attempt whatsoever to deal systematically with the issue of faculty evaluation. In some cases, in fact, evaluation of faculty was voluntary, left to the discretion of the individual faculty. In other cases where faculty were evaluated, the results were seldom systematically analyzed, either by the faculty member or the dean. Finally, we noticed pervasive ignorance, even on faculty development committees, about the availability of alternative faculty evaluation instruments — such as IDEA, TABS, CAFETERIA — that have been utilized nationally.

Secondly, we found only one actual attempt to deal with the issue of student advising, which is unavoidably a crucial aspect of a faculty member's role. Perhaps this is not surprising, given the lack of attention generally to this issue in higher education (Raskin, 1979). Yet one of the benefits of a student's attending a small liberal arts college is precisely his or her ability to develop a closer, more personal relationship with professors than he or she could at a larger bureaucratized institution. To find only one project addressed to the improvement of faculty advising skills is, then, disappointing and discouraging.

Impact on Colleges: General

In general the impact of the faculty development projects has been quite positive and substantial. In certain cases it could be documented with some assurance that a college was not the same as before the grant – scholarly output had increased; there was greater openness to sharing new approaches to teaching; the curriculum had been altered or strengthened at several key points; individual faculty had explored new areas of inquiry, renewed their commitment to ongoing research projects, and entertained new ideas about teaching.

Yet there were significant differences in the impact of grants among the twenty colleges. The following table illustrates the summative evaluations on the overall impact of the faculty development grants; the scores represent the team scores of the two interviewers on each campus.

TABLE 4

Impact of Grant Overall

What has been the *impact* of the grant — and the activities it has encouraged — on this institution? (How successful has it been in helping the college to achieve its overall institutional goal?)

Very Successful	*Successful*	*Partly Successful*	*Unsuccessful*
1-2	3-4	5-6	7-9
8 (40%)	7 (35%)	5 (25%)	0

Impact: Factors for Success

What makes for the difference in impact? That is, of course, the crucial question, which leads to a series of hypotheses regarding correlations between specific variables (aspects of the faculty development projects) and the overall success of the grant.

Each interviewer had the opportunity to rate the colleges on several variables, using a scale of 1 to 5, the lower the number the more positive the judgment. Many of the variables dealt with the *process* of faculty development, that is, ratings measured the processes by which faculty development programs were implemented at these colleges.

We developed a list of 33 variables which we felt to be potentially related to the overall impact of the grant. Of these we found that 7 really had an influence on the overall impact scores. The variables which we found to correlate with the overall impact are as follows:

1) Planning and Preparation: Were the grant activities carefully planned? Was preparation such that activities could begin soon after the grant was awarded?
2) Management/Administration: General Institutional. How did the management of the institution affect the faculty development program?
3) Management/Administration: The Grant Program. How was the grant itself administered? How did the management of the grant affect the program? (Was a faculty committee involved in allocating funds, or was this primarily in the hands of the Dean or the President?)
4) Clarity of Purpose: Were the purposes/goals of the faculty development program clear? Were any differences of interpretation evident? (Was there need to alter the original purposes?)
5) Spectrum of Involvement: Were a large percentage of the various departments and disciplines involved in the faculty development program? Or were activities limited to certain portions of the faculty? Was it

difficult to get any particular segment of the faculty involved (discipline, age-group, etc.)?

6) On-Campus Communication: How familiar were faculty, administrators, and students with the faculty development program supported by the grant? How was the program and its purposes made known throughout the campus?

7) Role of Department Heads: Were department chairpersons active in the faculty development activities? What roles were they expected to play? Did faculty members perceive that they received helpful support from department or division chairpersons?

In each case it was hypothesized that the aforementioned variables, where positive, would make a positive contribution to the overall impact; that is, as planning and preparation improved, as management processes improved, as the spectrum of involvement increased, as on-campus communication increased, as the purposes of the grant were clarified, and as the role of department heads expanded, the impact of the grant on the college would increase.

The data were put into a computer for correlation statistics, and a "t" statistic was printed out for each variable. Of the seven variables, four were found to have statistically significant relationships with the overall success measure. Below, each variable is presented with its corresponding "t" statistic.

1) It was hypothesized that *Planning and Preparation* would correlate with the overall success. It is logical to assume, after all, that a grant program will have more impact when preparations for its arrival have been carefully made.

In seven cases (37 percent) there was a very positive planning and preparation effort; in nine cases (48 percent) a positive effort, and in three cases (15 percent) there was a weak planning effort. In the three cases where a weak planning effort was recorded, the interviewers noted that the planning activities were hurried and that they involved only a few individuals. In these cases, the president, or the president and the dean, or perhaps these two figures with one or two faculty members, decided on the purposes of the grant according to *their* perception of needs.

Yet the statistical data do not reveal a significant relationship between the overall impact and Planning and Preparation ($t = 1.6$, where a significant correlation is 1.7 at the .05 level). Furthermore, Planning and Preparation was found to contribute only 13 percent to the variance of the overall impact score ($r^2 = .1297$).

Perhaps the weaker than expected correlation is explained by the fact that while planning and preparation are important, they are not as important as implementation and follow-up activities in faculty development. Many good plans are never implemented, and "the road to Hell is paved with good intentions!"

2) It was hypothesized that *General Institutional Management and Administration* would correlate strongly with the overall success scores, since the management of an institution plays an enormously important role in creating an atmosphere conducive to faculty growth and development. It is clear that a good part of faculy development relates to personnel management techniques about which more will be said later.

Happily, we found that the clear majority of colleges in our survey were not experiencing management difficulties. In fact 65 percent of the colleges (13 colleges) were found to have highly positive situations in terms of General Institutional Management. Thirty Percent of the colleges (6 colleges) were found to have moderately positive General Management situations.

Again, however, we did not find a statistically significant relationship between the overall success measures and General Institutional Management ($t = 1.2$, where a significant correlation is 1.7 at the .05 level).

At first this finding surprised us; however, we feel there is an explanation. The point is that an institution may be well managed, even superbly managed in general, but not as far as its faculty development program. This is a delicate area, involving the lives of real human beings who are suddenly asked to change their behavior, and it goes to the heart of their professional lives. Consequently faculty development programs require especially sensitive and flexible, albeit structured and resolute, leadership.

3) It was hypothesized that the *Grant Program Management and Administration* would correlate strongly with the overall success measures, since the administrative posture toward faculty development is quickly sensed and continually observed.

In this case we found a statistically significant relationship between the overall success measures and the variable, Program Management and Administration ($t = 4.8$, where 1.7 is a significant relationship at the .05 level). Furthermore, we found that this variable was contributing 56 percent of the variance to the overall success scores ($r^2 = .5687$).

To us, this correlation was expected. In order for a faculty development program to succeed its administration must be flexible, sensitive, meet legitimate needs among faculty, be strongly supportive and clearly structured.

Starting with the last point (structure), it is quite important for faculty and administrators to decide, as early as possible, the method of administration: how will the program be run, by whom and for what precise purposes? Will there be a faculty development committee to allocate grant money? Will the dean and the president have a more commanding role?

Bergquist recommends that faculty development programs in small liberal arts colleges be clearly and consistently viewed by both faculty and administrators as a "faculty-owned" operation (1979:56). In most cases we found this to be true.

On the other hand, we did encounter instances where a stronger, more direct

administrative presence was necessary to operationalize the grant. Often this results from the college's unique tradition, and sometimes from the particular phase of development at the college.

No matter what the structure of administration of the grant, the leaders and decision-makers involved must be flexible. They must reject fixity to a given course and recognize that needs might change and program priorities might shift. At one college we visited, for example, the dean at mid-course of the grant's life approached the funding agency to ask permission to shift monies for the development of a new series of projects addressed specifically to junior faculty. Permission was granted and the program is underway. At another college, however, it did not even occur to the administrators that they could shift priorities — until one of the interviewers made precisely that suggestion!

Furthermore, the administrators of the grant, and the college administrators in general, must be supportive; they must help bring about an atmosphere of trust and collegiality to nurture faculty growth. This is an absolute necessity.

Without trust, programs falter, as individuals search intensively for ulterior motives on the part of those "pushing" the programs. Without collegiality, programs and projects turn into mechanisms which further divide the faculty along several dimensions, including status, ego-strength, and standing with the administration. It is futile even to imagine a faculty member taking a colleague's course (which happened at two campuses we visited) without both people trusting one another and sharing a desire for mutual growth. Clearly, the college administration can do a great deal to encourage the establishment of trustful, collegial relationships among faculty (Gregory, 1979).

As well, it is important that there be a clear articulation of goals for the college by administrators, and that rewards be attached to faculty endeavors in meeting those goals. Without a clear reward structure accompanying a lucid articulation of goals for the college, programs falter, because faculty are reluctant to take risks. A good and, unfortunately recurring, example of this is seen in the issue of a faculty member's considering participation in the design and teaching of an interdisciplinary course or program on campus. Frequently, faculty members are prevented from participating in such programs because they honestly doubt the existence of rewards for doing so. Chairpersons fret about losing course coverage in the department. Colleagues muse about scholarly opportunities available in interdisciplinary endeavors often perceived as lacking in seriousness and rigor. And the administrators are silent, not wanting to take a stand, but actually supporting the status quo in their reticence. (The positive tenure decisions made regarding faculty who have participated in San Francisco State's interdisciplinary science/humanities program (NEXA) has contributed significantly to that program's success (Gregory, 1979).

4) Not surprisingly, a strong correlation was found between the overall success of the grant and the variable called *Clarity of Purpose* ($t = 3.12$, where 1.7 indicates a significant relationship at the .05 level). As well, the variable

was found to explain about 3½ percent of the variance of overall success (r^2 = .352).

Our observations indicate that faculty development programs are most successful when their goals are clearly elucidated and when those involved in administering the grant adhere to these goals sincerely, albeit not rigidly (as mentioned earlier). Having read all of the original proposals from the various administrators — usually college presidents — we noticed that some included lucid, precise, and clearly achievable goals. Others were far more vague, elusive, and almost ethereal in nature.

Almost all of the administrators in their letters alluded to an incipient crisis in higher education: shrinking enrollments, increasingly high percentages of entrenched faculty holding tenure, lack of infusion of new blood and new ideas, the changing nature of students, severe publication competition, and low faculty morale. And all of them saw faculty development in general as a way of overcoming these problems. But in devising specific programs for faculty development some college administrators and faculty were far more precise than were others.

Furthermore, having a clear purpose did not necessarily mean having an unalterable course. Again, success seemed to evolve from flexible, adaptable programs which were designed to meet specific needs, and not from unyielding attachment to particular ways of doing things. Generally, the colleges in our survey achieved clarity of purpose in dealing with their grants.

5) We hypothesized that the impact of the grant would increase as the *Spectrum of Involvement* expanded. We did find a significant correlation here (t = 1.9, where 1.7 indicate a significant relationship at the .05 level). However, we also found that this variable contributed relatively little to the explanation of variance (r^2 = 1.92).

Clearly, it is important to get as many faculty involved as possible in faculty development activities and to recognize the legitimacy of multiple avenues to success. As Light (1974) and others have already indicated, we in higher education have lived for a long time with a very narrow view of success. In general, success has been measured by a person's publication record, by his or her consultation schedule, and by the amount of money won by that person in grants and other awards.

Faculty development programs must seek to widen the scope of success among the professoriate. Options must be available for different kinds of growth. To be sure, some faculty will choose to travel the well-paved research and publication path. Others, however, will walk in groups and create exciting interdisciplinary courses. Still others will explore the paths not yet travelled, and try to design new learning systems or modules. All have an important contribution to make.

By expanding the spectrum of involvement, the colleges we visited made faculty development an accessible, almost democratic activity, instead of

reserving it for the already "successful" professors. The more faculty that feel "touched" by the grant program, the more impact that program is likely to have.

One caveat is in order. There are still faculty who do not respond to the challenge of faculty development. No matter how assiduously administrators work to solicit widespread faculty involvement, there are still those — on almost every campus — who prefer not to get involved. These individuals often choose to stand on the sidelines and echo the common words of despair about higher education. If there is a central challenge to faculty development it is to make programs so attractive that even the pessimists and cynics sign up for them.

6) *On-Campus Communication* was found to correlate strongly with the overall success score ($t = 2.65$, where 1.7 indicates a significant relationship at the .05 level). As well, this variable was found to contribute substantially to the explanation of variance ($r^2 = .281$). The strength of this variable surprised us, and we learned a great deal about effective approaches to faculty development through analyzing the details of communication. It is very important to the success of faculty development projects and programs that all of the faculty be familiar with the existence of the grant, the terms of the competition for awards, the successes and failures of ongoing projects, and any anticipated or actual changes in the direction of the grant.

Table 5 illustrates that most of the colleges in our sample had a positive situation regarding *On-Campus Communication*.

TABLE 5

In general, how successfully have the grant activities been communicated throughout the campus?

To A Great Degree	*To Some Degree*	*Very Little*
N %	N %	N %
13 (65%)	4 (20%)	3 (15%)

Of the three colleges where communication was found to be poor, two were judged to be in relatively good shape regarding the communication about the availability of the grant, but not in terms of results or outcomes of the grant. The evaluators felt this was a very important issue and the absence of this kind of communication hurt the grant substantially. In the third case, the communication was poor on all counts, but this was, obviously, an exception — and the college, when the situation prevailed, reflected a very low rating on overall impact.

7) Finally, we did not find a significant correlation between the overall success scores and our variable, *Role of Department Heads*. In fact, a negative correlation was found here ($t = -.954$). This was slightly surprising, but understandable in light of various features of the colleges we visited.

True, the department chairperson has a potentially significant, even invaluable, role to play in faculty development. The chairperson can monitor his faculty members' performance, praising them for achievements, gently pointing out problem areas, identifying possible resources, and suggesting new ideas. The chairperson can discuss with faculty members in a sympathetic and nonthreatening fashion issues of overriding importance to faculty, such as merit pay increases, personal problems, or student needs.

Yet our survey demonstrated that their potential is not realized in many cases. In the colleges we visited, the chairperson's role was often perceived as an "administrator" in the worst sense of that word — paper-pusher, a scheduler, and even a "henchman." At several of the colleges, this is a rotation position, either every three or every five years. And often the view is that being a chairperson is a good experience for the *individual*, and never mind what it does for the department as a whole. Successful faculty development programs often had to work *around* department chairpersons rather than *through* them.

Summary of Findings

Types of Programs and Success Rates

1) We found that the most frequently tried approach to faculty development and the approach which yielded the highest success rate was professional development.

2) We found that professional development activities included those conventionally enumerated, such as individual study leaves, attendance at professional meetings, and research and publication activities in a faculty member's discipline.

3) But, we also found new ways to address professional development which seemed equally successful. Among the new approaches to professional development we found faculty studying outside their major discipline, faculty developing new research competencies, and faculty taking a colleague's course.

4) We also found attempts at corporate or collective approaches to professional development. These included having campus-wide discussions about substantive liberal arts issues or having campus-wide workshops on developing faculty competencies in utilizing the computer or in improving their writing skills. All of these, of course, can be considered instructional development as well.

5) Efforts to develop projects in instructional development did not succeed at equally high levels. Faculty remain skeptical about workshops to help them improve their teaching.

6) But instructional development projects seem to succeed when they are organized around specific, usable skills, improving writing analysis skills or utilizing audio-visual equipment or the computer for teaching. Again, many successful projects in this area occurred in group settings.

7) Projects in curricular change yielded higher success rates than those in instructional development (but lower than in professional development) and were also tried more often.

8) Consideration of curricular changes often eventuated in consideration of pedagogical issues. Also, curricular discussions seemed to foster the breaking down of disciplinary boundaries which artificially separate faculty on most campuses.

9) A woefully neglected area in faculty development is organizational development. Only six projects were even undertaken in this area and of these only one was truly successful. Our perception, however, is that this is potentially the most critical dimension of faculty development, since it encompasses the reward structure at the college as well as the methods by which the college will fulfill its mission.

10) Two glaring inadequacies of the faculty development programs surveyed were their lack of attention to the questions of faculty advising and to faculty evaluation.

Variables Related to Overall Impact

1) As mentioned, the general impact of faculty development programs was substantial and positive. Yet significant differences did emerge in impact scores among the twenty colleges.

2) The more successful programs were characterized by a higher program management score; that is, the effective management of a faculty development program is absolutely essential for its success. And the management of the program in particular seems to be even more critical for faculty development success than the general management of the institution.

3) Components of effective management include: a clearly structured decision-making unit (either a faculty committee or a group of top administrators), the communication of the relation of faculty development activities to the college's reward structure, and the ability of decision-making to be flexible with regard to authorizing various approaches to faculty development.

4) Effective management also includes the specific task of communication. Leaders of the program must communicate openly to the rest of the campus the existence of the program, the terms of competition, and the successes or failures of ongoing projects.

5) Relatedly, we found that faculty development programs which solicit the participation of a wide spectrum of faculty will have greater impact than those which do not. Again, this suggests the importance of flexibility in approach to faculty development.

6) It is of utmost importance for both administrators and faculty to define clearly and from the outset the objectives of the faculty development program. What kinds of development — professional, instructional, curricular, organizational — are most important to the college? How can faculty development help the college meet new and unexpected demands? How will the college know it has achieved its faculty development activities?

7) The role of the department head is an often neglected dimension in faculty development programs. This is a very important link in the chain of command in the academy, and chairpersons have a potentially great role to play in faculty development.

References

Bergquist, William H. and Phillips, Steve R. *A Handbook for Faculty Development*. Vol. I, Washington, D.C.: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1975. Vol. II, 1977.

Chait, Richard. "Mission Madness Strikes Our Colleges." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. July 16, 1979.

Gaff, Jerry C. *Toward Faculty Renewal: Advances in Faculty, Instructional, and Organizational Development*. San Francisco. Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Gregory, Michael S. "NEXA: The Science-Humanities Convergence Program. San Francisco State University." *Liberal Education*, Spring, 1979.

Light, Donald. "Thinking About Faculty." *Daedalus*, 103, Fall, 1974.

Lindquist, Jack (ed.) *Designing Teaching Improvement Programs*. Washington, D.C., Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1979.

Raskin, Miriam. "Critical Issue: Faculty Advising." *Peabody Journal of Education*, 56, January, 1979.

Faculty Development: Perceived Needs for the 1980's

WILLIAM C. NELSEN

In the more than five hundred interviews on the twenty college campuses in the AAC Project on Faculty Development one question was almost invariably raised with both faculty and administrators: What do you perceive to be the major faculty development needs at your institution during the coming decade? The answers are revealing not only because of what needs were mentioned most frequently but also because of what issues were mentioned quite infrequently or not at all. It is also worthwhile to examine differences between faculty and administrators concerning their perceived needs.

The chart on the next page provides an indication of the perceptions of faculty and administrators concerning faculty development needs for the coming decade. It should be made clear that these perceptions were not gathered from some comprehensive survey instrument. These are the judgments of the interviewers as to what areas were mentioned by faculty and administrators most frequently — areas which were perceived to require new or increased attention by individual campuses in the 1980's.

What did faculty judge the most important areas of faculty development in the 1980's to be? As the chart indicates, fairly traditional areas of faculty support loomed largest. Financial support for research, travel to professional meetings, and continuing preparation in their own disciplines were mentioned quite frequently. Also of real concern is the inability of many faculty to take full-year sabbaticals. This has become an increasingly difficult problem in light of continuing inflation, the reluctance of spouses to leave employment situations, increased travel and living costs away from home, and other reasons. A few colleges that attach special value to year-long sabbaticals are trying to provide some supplementary support above and beyond the typical full-year at half-pay arrangement.

An interest in working more closely with colleagues was evidenced in several items. Group projects — faculty seminars, workshops, colloquia — and linking with faculty colleagues through interdisciplinary and core curriculum development were mentioned relatively frequently. It is interesting to note that this desire for the group approach to faculty renewal was most

prominent where faculty had already experienced the benefits of working more closely with colleagues and desired more of the same.

Concern for junior colleagues was also seen as an important issue on several campuses. Focusing on their development as both teachers and scholars, faculty were calling for research opportunities for younger faculty to help them move beyond their dissertations, and senior faculty were expressing willingness to accept some responsibility for assisting their junior colleagues in classroom teaching.

PERCEPTIONS BY FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATORS OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT NEEDS FOR THE 1980's (In Order of Frequency)

Note: The frequencies stated here indicate the number of institutions in the survey of 20 colleges where the interviewers judged the particular item to be an important concern on the campus among faculty or administrators. In each case the perceived need is for new or increased activity, not simply continuation of a present program.

Faculty		*Administrators*	
Support for research	12	Improvement of teaching	8
Supplementary support for sabbaticals	8	Creating an atmosphere of enthusiasm	6
Group Projects	6	Renewing mid-career faculty	5
Support for professional travel	5	Encouraging full-year sabbaticals	5
Additional preparation in discipline	5	Support for research	4
Interdisciplinary and core curricular development	5	Interdisciplinary and core curricular development	4
Junior faculty — research support	3	Special assistance for junior faculty	4
Junior faculty — assistance from senior faculty in teaching	3	Counseling for mid-career change and early retirement	4
Clearer expectations and rewards for development	3	Group projects	4
Counseling for alternative careers and early retirement	2	Good recruitment	3
Opportunities to teach in ones specialty	2	Faculty exchange	2
Improved secretarial and other faculty support services	2	Administrative development	2
Funds for innovation	2	Additional preparation in discipline	1
Faculty exchange	1		
Improved teaching skills	1		
Administrative development	1		
Assistance in seeking outside grants	1		

On several campuses faculty saw as a major need clearer answers to the following questions: What are the expectations of administrators and my colleagues concerning my ongoing professional development? What does the reward system really indicate concerning the importance of faculty development? Clearer answers to these questions — that is, when the answers are *higher expectations* and *more evident rewards* — would lead to increased motivation for development, according to many faculty.

In the remaining list of perceived needs by faculty two other items are worth noting. In light of the declining rate of turnover in the academy a great deal of attention is currently being given to counseling faculty for alternative careers and early retirement. As might be expected, however, this was not a self-perceived need of most faculty, as the chart indicates. Also, improvement in teaching was a relatively low priority among faculty for their own self-development.

On the administrative side of the chart there are a number of similarities, but also sharp differences in perceived needs. Most evident is the much greater concern among administrators for improved teaching on the campus. This is not surprising, as faculty are often reluctant to judge themselves as teachers and are skeptical of the value of teaching improvement programs. On the other hand, as several essays in this volume indicate, where such programs are carefully conceived and administered, many faculty have not only participated, but have benefitted considerably.

Curiously, a number of college presidents and deans used almost the same words in voicing the need to create (or recreate) an atmosphere of enthusiasm among faculty. This perceived need probably reflects both the administrative understanding of the mood of many faculty currently and the importance attached to having students encounter teachers who are enthusiastic about what they are doing.

Faculty at mid-career will require special attention in coming years according to several administrative leaders. This means designing programs that encourage their renewal as teachers and scholars within the academy or in certain cases having them consider more radical mid-career changes.

Administrators, like faculty, attached importance to research support, encouraging full-year sabbaticals, giving special assistance to younger faculty, and the value of group faculty development projects. These are areas where faculty and administrators will find major agreement in implementing programs.

Finally, it is worth noting that in these interviews concerning faculty development, several administrators reminded us that good faculty recruitment may have more to do with effective faculty development than anything else. Recruiting, and eventually tenuring faculty who not only show real promise as teacher-scholars, but also indicate a genuine commitment to continuing re-

newal will have more lasting effect on a campus than an ad hoc renewal program aimed at faculty of lesser quality and greater reluctance.

These are simply perceptions. But they have important implications for colleges wishing to begin, expand, or redesign faculty renewal programs in the coming decade — both because of what they say and for what they neglect to say. The following are conclusions by this author drawn from these perceptions in the context of the total AAC Project on Faculty Development.

1. A wide variety of needs will continue to exist on college campuses. Therefore, faculty development programs must be flexible to meet the variety of needs of individual faculty and individual situations.
2. Faculty will continue to see their needs primarily in relation to their disciplinary professions. To be sure, faculty must receive support as researchers and contributors to their disciplines, but faculty must also be introduced to the wider possibilities for renewal of themselves and their colleges' academic programs. This will require not only widespread faculty involvement but also administrative leadership in program design.
3. Administrative leadership is especially required in areas where faculty are reluctant to take initiative. For example, most faculty are not prepared to push for programs in the sensitive realm of teaching; but successful teaching improvement programs are possible where administrators have enlisted the aid of several key faculty in designing carefully formulated programs with a good specific focus.
4. Corporate faculty development activity will receive fairly strong support from both faculty and administrators. Where individual opportunities (sabbaticals, summer study, released time) have been balanced by group activities (institutes, workshops, joint study), the academic program has benefited from not only substantive learning but also stronger intellectual and personal bonds.
5. Neither faculty nor administrators focused on a crucial element in the academy, namely, the *students*, in reflecting on needs. As several of the essays in this volume indicate, however, helping faculty to understand better both students and the learning process itself can have a profound effect on encouraging faculty to reassess what they are doing as teachers.
6. In light of the attention being given to counseling faculty concerning alternative careers, some words of caution may be important. Faculty will not readily pursue these alternatives. Moreover, there is a danger that if we work too hard at creating alternative career programs we may lose some of our best faculty. Yes, there is promise in this new emphasis on faculty career development, but careful individual counseling may be more prudent for the academy than large-scale programs.
7. It is vitally important that in devising programs of faculty renewal both faculty and administrators understand each other's perceptions of the

most important needs. Failure to take stock of each other's perceptions can lead to misunderstanding and misspent efforts.

What is the future of faculty development in the 1980's? While there may be disagreements among faculty and administrators as to specific perceived needs and programs called for, there is no disagreement among them on the importance of support for faculty renewal during the years to come. In order for colleges to meet the challenges of the 1980's with relatively stable faculties, both administrators and faculty are strong in their feelings that faculty development will be more important than ever!

Effective Approaches to Faculty Development

These essays and analytical articles report on projects and programs which the AAC Project on Faculty Development found to be relatively successful. The Project, including this publication, was made possible by a grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. This volume will be helpful to colleges whether beginning, evaluating, changing, or enlarging programs in faculty renewal.

The Editors

William C. Nelsen is Vice President and Dean of the College, St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota, President-Elect of Augustana College, Sioux Falls, S.D., and served as Director of the AAC Project on Faculty Development.

Michael E. Siegel is Assistant Professor of Government and Public Administration, The American University, Washington, D.C. and served as Assistant Director of the AAC Project on Faculty Development.

Association of American Colleges